



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

480
B82
1891

A 476680

Impeachment
of the
HOUSE of BRUNSWICK

Charles Bradlaugh



Sincerely
Hannah Lightfoot

127 **CURIOUS.** Hannah Lightfoot,
 Queen Charlotte and the Chevalier D'Eon
 Dr. Wilmot's Polish Princes, by William
 J. Thomas, F.S.A., reprinted with some
 additions from Notes and Queries, 8vo,
 original cloth, very curious, 3s 1867

THE
IMPEACHMENT
OF THE
HOUSE OF BRUNSWICK.

BY

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read 'A. and H. Bradlaugh Bonner'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long horizontal flourish at the bottom.

TENTH EDITION.
PARTLY REVISED AND RE-WITTEN.
(FIRST EDITION, 1871.)

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY A. AND H. BRADLAUGH BONNER.

SOLD BY R. FORDER,
28 STONECUTTER STREET, E.C.

1891.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

DA
480
.B82
1891

LONDON:

A. BONNER, PRINTER, 34 BOUVERIE STREET,
FLEET STREET, E.C.

0921589-190

PREFACE TO THE TENTH EDITION.

THE present edition of "The Impeachment of the House of Brunswick" was partly revised by Mr. Bradlaugh two or more years ago, when it was thought that the last edition had gone out of print, thus making it necessary to issue a new one. When, however, he had revised about half the book a large number of the last issue were found, and there was no longer any urgency for the new edition. Consequently the work was put aside for the revision to be continued in time which might be spared from other and more pressing work. But that time never arrived, and as the pages were put aside so I found them a few months ago.

I now issue the book as he left it, with the first fifty-five pages corrected, considerably added to, and generally revised. The later pages are untouched, and remain as they were in the last edition.

In the appearance of the book we have departed from the fashion of all former editions, in order to make it uniform with Mr. Bradlaugh's "Collected Speeches", "Labor and Law," and "Doubts in Dialogue". We have now also added a valuable index which will be very welcome in these days of haste and hurry, and for which I am indebted to my friend, Mrs. Mary Reed.

My best thanks are due to Mr. John M. Robertson for his kindness in seeing through the press this, as well as the other of my father's works issued since his death.

HYPATIA BRADLAUGH BONNER.

Dedication to the Ninth Edition.

Dedicated

(WITHOUT PERMISSION)

TO

LORD R. H. S. CHURCHILL,

AND

SIR H. D. WOLFF,

AS SOME ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THEIR EFFECTUAL ADVERTISEMENT
OF THE SIXTH, SEVENTH, AND EIGHTH EDITIONS.

MARCH, 1883.

INDEX.

A.

	PAGE
Abercromby, Sir Ralph, and troops in Ireland	85
Abingdon, Earl of, on the Succession	5
Acts of Settlement and Union, Reasons for Repeal of ..	2, 3, 6, 7, 9
Acts, Anti-Combination	24
" Royal Marriage	52
" Treason and Sedition	79
" for the Suppression of "Corresponding Societies" ..	86
Albert the " Good "	126, 127
Alison, Reference to	79
American Colonies, Taxation of, 49, 52, 53, 54 ; Resistance of to Lord North's Government, 53, 54 ; Burke and the, 55 ; the War and Chatham 56 ; Declaration of the Congress	56

B.

Ballot, Election by	122
Bernstoff, Baron	15
Bread Riots	78, 79
" Bribery and Corruption " in Creation of Peers, 18, 26, 112 ; in the Commons, Army, and Public Offices, etc., 15, 17, 18, 26, 28, 36, 44, 45, 46, 89, 90	91
Brougham, Reference to, 96, 104 ; his defence of Caroline and disgrace, 110 ; in the Whig Ministry	119, 121
Brunswick, House of, hostile to the Country's welfare, 7 ; Defenders of, 29 ; Squibs and Caricatures of the, 16, 24, 30, 45, 63-65, 73, 79, 81, 82	
Buckle	8, 37, 79, 105
Burdett, Sir F., On the King's Insanity	94
Burke and the Colonies, 55 ; On National Taxation	58
Burney, Miss	68
Bute, Lord, Reference to	41, 42, 44, 47

C.

Cambridge, Duke of, and the factory " turn outs "	128
Canning, Reference to	101, 114, 115
Caroline, Queen, Marriage, 22 ; Opinion of her Son, 21, 22 ; Influence, Domestic and Political, 22, 23 ; Death	27
" .. " of Brunswick, Marriage, 76 ; Warrant issued against, 87 ; Complaints of, 96, 110 ; Quits England, 97 ;	

	PAGE
Caroline, Queen, Charged with Adultery, 108; Popular Feeling, 108, 109, 111, 112; Trial, 109, 110; Death and Funeral	111, 112
Carteret, Lord (see Granville, Lord).	
Cassilis, Lord, on Distress in England and Royal Extravagance ..	105
Castlereagh, Lord, and the Secret Service Money, 109; Hated by the People, 113; Death	112
Catholic Emancipation, Measures Against, 95, 114; Bill Passed ..	116
Cato Street Conspiracy	106, 107
Charlotte, Princess of Wales Born, 82; Marriage of, 99; Death ..	100
Chatham, Lord, on American War	56
Chesterfield, Lord	13, 22, 45
Civil List and Royal Grants, 11-13, 19, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31-34, 36, 44, 52, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 72, 75, 76, 80, 81, 86, 87, 93, 95-99, 101, 103, 105, 110, 111, 115, 121; Present Reign, 126; History of Growth of	131-144
Clive, Lord	53
Coalition Ministry, The	59, 60
Cobbett, Wm.	108
Convention of 1688, 3; of 1659, 4; of 1461	4
Cotton, Sir J. Hinde, on the Riot Act	15
Cowper, Lady	18, 22
Cumberland, Duke of, Cruelty and Vicious Character, 32, 33; Death ..	50

D.

Danish Treaty, The	28
De Broglie, Extracts from Secret Correspondence	14
Denman's Indictment of the Dukes of York and Clarence	109
Dilke, Sir C. and Civil List Returns	133
Disraeli, Reference to	94, 124, 128
Divine Right	4
Doran, Dr. and Court Scandal	41, 43, 50, 60, 69, 98, 109
Duchesse d'Orleans, on the English and the Hanoverian Succession ..	10
Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster, The	71, 138, 139, 143

E AND F.

Erskine, Defence of Tooke and Others	77, 78
Foreign Subsidies	16, 24, 32-34, 37, 47, 48, 58, 95, 96
Foster, Mr. Justice, Reference to	5, 6
Fox	5, 36, 39, 44, 46, 57, 59, 60, 62, 67, 69
French War, The	79, 81

G.

George I; Succession; Why and How Elected, 1, 2, 10; Effect on Ireland, 20; Ignorance and Vice, 8, 13, 14, 16-18; Debts, 19; Murder of Konigsmark, 11; Foreign Policy, 16; Death ..	19, 20
George II, 19-21; Marriage, 22; Domestic Relations and Vice, 23, 27, 28;	

INDEX.

ix

	PAGE.
Debts, 24, 26, 33; Foreign Subsidies and Wars, 28-32, 34; Character, 34, 35; Death	34.
George III; Ascension, 36; Civil List, 36, 52, 57, 58, 61, 63, 72, 86, 87, 93, 96, 97, 99; Character, 37-39, 41, 42, 59, 104; Changes Character of Upper House, 40; A Bigamist, 42, 43; Insanity, 50, 68, 86, 93; The Colonies, 53, 55, 57, 59; Bill for the Regency, 50; Debts, 57, 61, 63, 86, 87, 99; Distress of the Country, 78; Pretended Plot of Assassination, 77; Irish Policy, 82-86; The Regency, 93; Death of the King	104.
George IV; Birth, 44; Marries and Repudiates Mrs. Fitzherbert, 61, 62; Unfilial Conduct, 59-61, 69, 71; Vice, 61, 62, 71, 75, 87, 110; Coronation, 105, 106; Civil List, Debts, and Extravagance, 60-63, 75, 76, 86, 93, 95-97, 99, 101, 103, 105, 110, 111, 115, 116; Complaint of the Citizens on Increase of Civil List, 99; Visit to Ireland, 111, 112; Intolerance towards the Catholics, 114; Death of Caroline, 111; Character and Death	116.
Granville, Earl (Lord Carteret)	18, 26, 30, 31, 70
Grenville, Lord	8, 45, 70, 87
Grey, Earl, on the National Condition, 7, 8; in the Whig Ministry	119, 120-122, 137

H.

Halifax, Lord, and Wilkes	48
Hallam on the Popular Discontent	16.
Hardinge, Judge	5
Harrison, Mr. F., Criticism of	123
Hervey's "Memoirs"	8, 21, 22, 27, 28
Hume, Joseph, and the Radical Members' Protest against Royal Expenditure	120, 126

I.

Impey, Judge, Infamous Conduct of	68
India and England under George III.	66-68.
Ireland, Condition of, under George III, 82-86, 112, 113; Failure of the Potato Crop, 128; Woollen Exports	58

J.

Jesse's "Memoirs of the Court"	13, 59, 61, 70.
--	-----------------

K.

Kent, Duke of, Marriage, 101; Dislike to, 101, 102; Character and Death	101-103
---	---------

L.

Lansdowne, Marquis of, on Royal Succession	5
Legislature, The Rights of the	2, 3, 4-6
Liverpool, Lord, and the infamous "Six Acts"	104
Lords, House of, its Superiority to the Commons	40
Luttrell, Hon. Temple, Speech of	4

M.

Macaulay, Lord, Opinions of	12, 13, 29, 35, 37, 41, 42, 60, 65
Maintenon, Madame de, Opinion of George I	8
Milton, Lord, advises the people to refuse payment of taxes	123
Moir, Lord, on Government of Ireland	83
Molloy, on the Court	1, 10, 14
Munster, Earl of, commits suicide	128
Murder, Charge of, against Duke of Cumberland	91-93

N.

National Debt, how created and increased .. 7, 9, 11, 29, 31, 52, 57, 79, 80, 81, 96, 104	
North, Lord, and the Marriage Act, 52; and the Weavers, 53; and the Colonies	53, 57, 59, 60
<i>Northern Star</i> , Prosecution of	85

O.

O'Connell, D., Reference to	92, 121
Olivia Willmot Serres	111

P.

Paine and the Rights of Man, Trial and State Prosecutions ..	74, 75
Parliament, The Right of, to determine the Succession ..	2, 3, 5, 6
Pauperism and Taxation, Increase of, under Victoria ..	129
Peace of Paris	44
Pensions .. 7, 13, 23, 44, 57, 58, 97, 99, 118, 119-133, 138, 140, 142-3	
Pensioners, Bill to disable	25
Peterloo Outrage	104, 107
Phillimore	35, 42, 43, 44, 53, 69, 104
Pitt, William, Debate on the Succession, 4, 5; Resistance to Continental Subsidies, 19, 24; Hated by George III ..	39
Pitt the younger and George III	36-39, 41, 46, 60, 69, 77
Poverty in England and the Royal Grants	95, 99, 100, 121
"Principles of the Constitution" (see Foster, Mr. Justice).	
Prosecution of Lord Melville	87

R.

Raikes, a King worshipper, opinion of William IV	124
Rebellion of 1745	32, 33
Reform Bill	122
Religious and Political Liberty, Repression of ..	81, 83-85, 95, 100
Rights of the People	4, 5
Riots of 1766-7	51

S.

Septennial Parliaments Bill	15
South Sea Bill	17

INDEX.

xi

	PAGE
Stamp Act	49
Standing Armies, protest against	25, 26, 30
Stephen's Commentaries, [Reference to	6
Stormont, Lord	5
Stockmar, Baron, and his influence with the Commons, 127; his secret policy	127
Suffrage, Universal	122
Swift Jonathan, "Drapier Letters," 19; "Modest Proposal "	20

T.

Thackeray	10-12, 15, 21, 22, 27, 41, 63, 76, 99, 117
Thurlow, and the Regency Bill, 69; Supports the Slave Trade	69
Tory and Church Alliance	37
Treason High, Charge of, against Horne Tooke, and others	76, 77, 78
Trials, Remarkable, of Hold and Winterbottom, 73; of Paine and the Scottish Political Martyrs	74, 75
Triennial Parliaments	15, 30

U.

'United Irishmen "	83
----------------------------	----

V.

Vaughan, George, Examination of	29
Victoria, Queen, born, 103; Accession, 126; Marriage, 126; Influence in State policy mischievous, 129; wealth of, 129; increase of Imperial Taxation, pauperism, and strikes, 129; the Civil List	140

W.

Waldegrave, Lord, Opinion of George II, 34; "Memoirs"	42
Wallace, "Life of George IV "	114-117
Walpole, H., On the Court	14, 41, 43, 44, 45, 59
„ Sir R.	21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30
Wardle, Col., and the Army Corruption	88-90
Warren Hastings, impeachment of	63, 64, 65-68
Waste Lands, enclosure of	19, 51
Weavers Distress and attempt at Combination, 53; wages	105
Wellington, Duke of, Reference to	119, 120
Whigs, The, their action with Stuarts and Guelphs, 2; favored by the Georges, 13; their infringement of public liberty, 14, 15; augmentation of the army, 18; assailed by the <i>Craftsman</i> , 24; decline of, 37; ministry formed under William, their disloyalty to the people	119, 121
Wilkes John, References to	41, 47, 69
William IV, birth, marriage and succession, 118; the king's ministry, 119; rupture on the Civil List, 120; dislike to reform, 120, 121, 122, 123; in favor of Slave Trade, 122; treatment of Mrs. Jordan,	

118; symptoms of insanity, 124; popular opinion, 123; vice,
125; death and character 8, 125.

Y.

York, Frederick Duke of, born, 48; filial conduct, 69, 70: scoundrelism,
71, 72; marriage, 72; military corruption under, 88, 89, 90, 91;
reappointment as Commander-in-Chief, 94; military scandal
against, 102, 103; guardianship of the king, 103; the Crown
diamonds, 109; death 114
Yorkshire Petition, The 58

THE IMPEACHMENT
OF
THE HOUSE OF BRUNSWICK.



CHAPTER I.

ERRATUM.

Page 123, line 19, for "have" read "gave".

[Impeachment.]

France, Scotland, and Ireland. The official delusion that our monarchs ruled also over France was kept up until the commencement of the present century. Mr. J. Fitzgerald Molloy (who in his "Court Life below Stairs" has often availed himself of the earlier editions of the present work, but who has never thought right to refer to my pages as his source of information) says that the election of George 1st "as king was solely founded on the choice of the majority of Parliament; the reason for which was because he professed the Protestant religion. Admitting the male line of the House of Stuart to have ended

in James II, the 'right of blood' rested in the House of Savoy, through Henrietta, Duchess of Orleans, daughter of Charles I, so that more than fifty persons, whose claims were nearer than that of the Elector, were quietly passed over."

It is said, and perhaps truly, that the German Protestant Guelph was an improvement on the Catholic Stuart, and the Whigs take credit for having effected this change in spite of the Tories. This credit they deserve; but it must not be forgotten that scarcely half a century before the entire aristocracy, including the patriotic Whigs, had coalesced to restore to the throne the Stuarts, who had been driven away by Cromwell. If this very aristocracy, of which the Whigs form a part, had never assisted in calling back the Stuarts in the person of Charles II, there would have been no need to thank them for again turning that family out.

The object of this essay is to submit reasons for the repeal of the Acts of Settlement and Union, so far as the succession to the throne is concerned, after the abdication or demise of the present monarch. It is assumed, as a point upon which all supporters of the present royal family will agree, that the right to deal with the throne is inalienably vested in the English people, to be exercised by them through their representatives in Parliament. The right of the members of the House of Brunswick to succeed to the throne is a right accruing only from the Acts of Settlement and Union, it being clear that, except for these statutes, they had no claim to the throne. It is therefore submitted that should Parliament in its wisdom think fit to enact that after the death or abdication of her present Majesty, the throne shall no longer be filled by a member of the House of Brunswick, such an enactment would be perfectly within the competency of Parliament. It is further submitted that Parliament has full and uncontrollable authority to make any enactment, and to repeal any enactment heretofore made even if such new statute, or the repeal of any old statute, should in truth change the constitution of the Empire, or modify the character and powers of either Parliamentary Chamber. The Parliament of the English Commonwealth, which met on April 25th, 1660, gave the crown to Charles II,

In fact two clauses of sec. 3 of the Act of Settlement were repealed in the reign of Queen Anne, 4 and 5 Anne c. 20, a third clause was repealed early in the reign of George I (1 Geo. I, stat. 2 c. 51), and a fourth clause was partly repealed by 7 and 8 Vict. c. 66 and virtually repealed as to a class by 33 Vict. c. 14 § 7, showing that this particular statute has never been considered irrepealable. It is true that the clauses repealed were of consequence to the nation, and that their repeal was by the Crown.

E

derives from the people, and that the people are under no irrevocable contract or obligation to continue any member of the House of Brunswick on the throne. The following Parliamentary *dicta* support this opinion :

The Honorable Temple Luttrell, in a speech made in the House of Commons, on the 7th November, 1775, showed "that of thirty-three sovereigns since William the Conqueror, thirteen only have ascended the throne by divine hereditary right. . . . The will of the people, superseding any hereditary claim to succession, at the commencement of the twelfth century placed Henry I on the throne", and this subject to conditions as to laws to be made by Henry. King John was compelled solemnly to register an assurance of the ancient rights of the people in a formal manner; and this necessary work was accomplished by the Congress at Runnymede, in the year 1115. "Sir, in the reign of Henry III (about the year 1223), the barons, clergy, and freeholders, understanding that the King, as Earl of Poitou, had landed some of his continental troops on the western ports of England, with a design to strengthen a most odious and arbitrary set of ministers, they assembled in a Convention or Congress, whence they despatched deputies to King Henry, declaring that if he did not immediately send back those Poitouviens, and remove from his person and councils evil advisers, they would place upon the throne a prince who should better observe the laws of the land. Sir, the King not only hearkened to the Congress, but shortly after complied with every article of their demand, and publicly notified his reformation. Now, sir, what are we to call that assembly which dethroned Edward II when the Archbishop of Canterbury preached a sermon on this text, '*The voice of the people is the voice of God*'?" "A Prince of the House of Lancaster was invited over from banishment, and elected by the people to the throne", on the fall of Richard II. "I shall next proceed to the general Convention and Congress, which in 1461 enthroned the Earl of March by the name of Edward IV, the Primate of all England collecting the suffrages of the people." "In 1659 a Convention or Congress restored legal Monarchy in the person of Charles II."

William Pitt, on the 16th December, 1788, being then Chan-

cellor of the Exchequer, contended that "the right of providing for the deficiency of Royal authority rested with the two remaining branches of the Legislature;" and asked, "on the disability of the Sovereign, where was the right to be found? It was to be found in the voice, in the sense of the people, with them it rested". On the 22nd December Mr. Pitt said that Mr. Fox had contended that "the two Houses of Parliament cannot proceed to legislate without a King". His (Mr. Pitt's) answer was: "The conduct of the Revolution had contradicted that assertion; they had acted legislatively, and, no King being present, they must consequently have acted without a King".

Mr. Hardinge, afterwards Solicitor-General and Judge, in the same debate, said: "The virtues of our ancestors and the genius of the Government accurately understood, a century ago, had prompted the Lords and Commons of the realm to pass a law without a King; and a law which, as he had always read it, had put upon living record this principle: 'That whenever the express executive hand shall have lost its power to act, the people of the land, fully and freely represented, can alone repair the defect'."

On the 26th December, in the House of Lords, discussing the power to exclude a sitting Monarch from the throne, the Earl of Abingdon said: "Will a King exclude himself? No no! my Lords, that exclusion appertains to us and to the other House of Parliament exclusively. It is to us it belongs, it is our duty. It is the business of the Lords and Commons of Great Britain, and of us alone, as the trustees and representatives of the nation." And, following up this argument, Lord Abingdon contended that, in the contingency he was alluding to, "the right to new model or alter the succession vests in the Parliament of England without the King, in the Lords and Commons of Great Britain solely and exclusively."

Lord Stormont, in the same debate, pointed out that William III "possessed no other right to the throne than that which he derived from the votes of the two Houses".

The Marquis of Lansdowne said: "One of the best constitutional writers we had was Mr. Justice Foster, who, in his book on the 'Principles of the Constitution', denies the right

even of hereditary succession, and says it is no right whatever, but merely a political expedient. . . . The Crown, Mr. Justice Foster said, was not merely a descendable property like a laystall or a pigstye, but was put in trust for millions, and for the happiness of ages yet unborn, which Parliament has it always in its power to mould, to shape, to alter, to fashion, just as it shall think proper. And, in speaking of Parliament", his lordship said, "Mr. Justice Foster repeatedly spoke of the two Houses of Parliament only".

"Stephen's Commentaries", vol. 2, p. 430, says that the executive power of the English nation is vested in a single person by the general consent of the people; but "that the right of the reigning prince may from time to time be set aside by Act of Parliament in favor of a new sovereign"; and on page 435, "The doctrine of hereditary right does by no means imply an indefeasible right to the throne—". "It is unquestionably in the breast of the supreme legislative authority of the Kingdom—the sovereign and both Houses of Parliament—to defeat this hereditary right" "to exclude the immediate heir and vest the inheritance in anyone else." Stephen, p. 445, quotes 7 Henry IV, cap. 2, as showing "that the King and Parliament had a right to new model and regulate the succession"; p. 449, that the 13 Elizabeth, cap. 1, declares it high treason to affirm that "laws and statutes do not bind the right of the Crown, and the descent, limitation, inheritance or government thereof". On p. 452 he gives "those instances wherein the Parliament since the restoration has asserted or exercised this right of altering or limiting the succession, a right which was before exercised and asserted in the reign of Henry IV, Henry VII, Henry VIII, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth." His first instance is the Bill of Exclusion, which passed both Houses, but was vetoed by Charles II, and which proposed to set aside the King's brother and presumptive heir. Stephen says this shows "That the Parliament had the power to have defeated the inheritance". Thus in 1688 "it was the act of the nation alone".

My object being to procure the repeal by Parliament of the only title under which any member of the House of Brunswick

could claim to succeed the present sovereign on the throne, or to procure a special enactment which shall for the future exclude the Brunswicks, as the Stuarts were excluded in 1688 and 1701, the following grounds are submitted as justifying and requiring such repeal or new enactment :

1st. That during the period through which the Brunswick family have reigned over the British Empire, the policy and conduct of the majority of the members of that family, and especially of the various reigning members, always saving and excepting her present Majesty, have been hostile to the welfare of the mass of the people. This will be sought to be proved by a sketch of the principal events in the reign of each monarch, from August 1st, 1714, to the present date.

2nd. That during the same period nearly fourteen-fifteenths of the entire National Debt have been created, and that the balance due of this debt is in great part the result of wars arising from the mischievous and pro-Hanoverian policy of the Brunswick family.

3rd. That in consequence of the incompetence or want of desire for governmental duty on the part of the first four of the reigning members of the House of Brunswick, the governing power of the country has been practically limited to a few families who have used government in too many instances as a means of advancing their own interests ; while it is submitted that government should be the best contrivance of national wisdom for the alleviation of national suffering and promotion of national happiness. Earl Grey declared that " Our national annals since the Revolution of 1688 present a sad picture of the selfishness, baseness, and corruption of the great majority of the actors on the political stage ".

4th. That a huge pension list was created, the recipients of the largest pensions, or of the commutation price for such pensions, being in most cases persons who were already members of wealthy families, and who had done nothing whatever to justify their being kept in idleness at the national expense.

5th. That the preceding monarchs of the Brunswick family have been, except in a few cases where they have distinguished themselves by vicious interference, costly puppets, useful only

to the governing aristocracy as a cloak to shield the real wrongdoers from the just reproaches of the people.

6th. That the Brunswick family have shown themselves utterly incapable of initiating or encouraging wise legislation. George I was shut out practically from the government by his utter ignorance of the English language, his want of sympathy with British habits, and his frequent absences from this country. A volume of history, published by Messrs. Longman in 1831, says that "George I continued a German princeling on the British throne—surrounded still by his petty Hanoverian satellites, and so ignorant even of the language of his new subjects, that his English minister, who understood neither French nor German, could communicate with him only by an imperfect jargon of barbarous Latin." He "discarded his wife, and had two mistresses publicly installed in their Court rights and privileges". Earl Grey affirms that "the highly beneficial practice of holding Cabinet Councils without the presence of the sovereign arose from George the First's not knowing English". Leslie describes George I as altogether ignorant of our language, laws, customs, and constitution. Madame de Maintenon writes of him as disgusted with his subjects. George II was utterly indifferent to English improvement, and was mostly away in Hanover. Lord Hervey's "Memoirs" portray him as caring for nothing but soldiers and women, and declare that his highest ambition was to combine the reputation of a great general with that of a successful libertine. George III was repeatedly insane, and in his officially lucid moments his sanity was more dangerous to England than his madness. Buckle says that he was "despotic as well as superstitious. . . . Every liberal sentiment, everything approaching to reform, nay, even the mere mention of inquiry, was an abomination in the eyes of that narrow and ignorant prince." Lord Grenville, his Prime Minister, said of him: "He had perhaps the narrowest mind of any man I ever knew". George IV was a dissipated, drunken debauchee, bad husband, unfaithful lover, untrustworthy friend, unnatural father, corrupt regent, and worse king. Buckle speaks of "the incredible baseness of that ignoble voluptuary". William IV was obstinate and

untruthful, but fortunately, fearful of losing his crown, gave way to progress with a bad grace when chicanery was no longer possible, and continued resistance became dangerous.

7th. That, under the Brunswick family, the national expenditure has increased to a frightful extent, while our best possessions in America have been lost, and our home possession, Ireland, rendered chronic in its discontent by the terrible misgovernment under the four Georges.

And, 8th. That the ever increasing burden of the national taxation has been shifted from the land on to the shoulders of the middle and lower classes, the landed aristocracy having, until very lately, enjoyed the practical monopoly of tax-levying power.

CHAPTER II.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE I.

On August 1st, 1714, George Lewis, Elector of Hanover, and great-grandson of James I of England, succeeded to the throne; but apparently doubtful as to the reception he would meet in this country he delayed visiting his new dominions until the month of October. In April, 1714, there was so little disposition in favor of the newly-chosen dynasty, that the Earl of Oxford entreated George not to bring any of his family into England without Queen Anne's express consent. Madame Elizabeth Charlotte, Duchesse d'Orleans, expresses her hesitation "to rejoice at the accession of our Prince George, for she had no confidence in the English"; and her fears "that the inconstancy of the English will in the end produce some scheme which may be injurious to the French monarchy". She adds: "If the English were to be trusted, I should say that it is fortunate the Parliaments are in favor of George, but the more one reads of the history of English revolutions the more one is compelled to remark the eternal hatred which the people of that nation have had towards their kings, as well as their fickleness". To-day it is the English who charge the French with fickleness. Thackeray says that George I "showed an uncommon prudence and coolness of behavior when he came into his kingdom, exhibiting no elation; reasonably doubtful whether he should not be turned out some day; looking upon himself only as a lodger, and making the most of his brief tenure of St. James's and Hampton Court, plundering, it is true, somewhat, and dividing amongst his German followers; but what could be expected of a sovereign who at home could sell his subjects at so many ducats per head, and make no scruple in so disposing of them?" Molloy quotes the French ambassador as writing to the King of France that George I "rather

considers England a temporary possession, to be made the most of while it lasts, than as a perpetual inheritance to himself and family. To this statement the King's acts during his reign bear strong testimony". At the accession of George I the national debt of this country, exclusive of annuities, was about £36,000,000; and after five Brunswicks have left us it is £738,000,000 for Great Britain and Ireland, and much more than £130,000,000 for India. The annual national expenditure under the rule of George I was about £6,000,000; for 1887 it was about £89,996,000. During the reign of George I land paid very nearly one-fourth the whole of the taxes; to-day it pays less than one-eightieth part; and yet, while land's proportion of the burden is so much lighter, its exaction from labor in rent is many times heavier.

George I came to England without his wife, whom, years before, he had arrested and placed in close confinement in Ahlden Castle, on account of her intrigue with Philip, Count Konigsmark, whom some say George I suspected of being the actual father of the Electoral Prince George, afterwards George II. To use the language of a writer patronised by George, Prince of Wales, in 1808: "The coldness between George I, and his son and successor, George II, may be said to have been *almost coeval with the existence* of the latter." Our king, George I,—described by Thackeray as a "cold, selfish libertine"—had Konigsmark murdered in the palace of Heranhausen; confined his wife, at twenty-eight years of age, in a dungeon, where she remained until she was sixty; and when George Augustus, Electoral Prince of Hanover, tried to get access to his mother, George Lewis, then Elector of Hanover, arrested Prince George also, and, it is said, would have put him to death if the Emperor of Germany had not protected him as a Prince of the German Empire. During the reign of George II, Frederick, Prince of Wales, whom his father denounced as "a changeling", published an account of how George I had turned Frederick's father out of the palace. These Guelphs have been ever a loving family. The *Edinburgh Review* declares that "the terms on which the eldest sons of this family have always lived with their fathers have

been those of distrust, opposition, and hostility". Even after George Lewis had ascended the throne of England, his hatred to George Augustus was so bitter that there was some proposition that James, Earl Berkeley and Lord High Admiral, should carry off the Prince to America, and keep him there.

Thackeray says: "When George I made his first visit to Hanover, his son was appointed regent during the Royal absence. But this honor was never again conferred on the Prince of Wales; he and his father fell out presently. On the occasion of the christening of his second son, a Royal row took place, and the Prince, shaking his fist in the Duke of Newcastle's face, called him a rogue, and provoked his august father. He and his wife were turned out of St. James's, and their princely children taken from them, by order of the Royal head of the family. Father and mother wept piteously at parting from their little ones. The young ones sent some cherries, with their love to papa and mamma: the parents watered the fruit with their tears. They had no tears thirty-five years afterwards when Prince Frederick died, their eldest son, their heir, their enemy."

Mahon, despite all his desire to make out the best for the Whig revolution and its consequences, occasionally makes some pregnant admissions: "The jealousy which George I entertained for his son was no new feeling. It had existed even at Hanover, and had since been inflamed by an insidious motion of the Tories that out of the Civil List £100,000 should be allotted as a separate revenue for the Prince of Wales. This motion was over-ruled by the Ministerial party, and its rejection offended the Prince as much as its proposal had the King. . . . In fact it is remarkable . . . that since that family has reigned the heirs apparent have always been on ill terms with the sovereign. There have been four Princes of Wales since the death of Anne, and all four have gone into bitter opposition." "That family," said Lord Carteret one day in full Council, "always has quarrelled, and always will quarrel, from generation to generation."

"Through the whole of the reign of George I, and through nearly half the reign of George II," says Lord Macaulay, "a

Tory was regarded as the enemy of the reigning house, and was excluded from all the favors of the Crown. Though most of the country gentlemen were Tories, none but Whigs were appointed deans and bishops. In every county opulent and well-descended Tory Squires complained that their names were left out of the Commission of the Peace, while men of small estate and of mean birth, who were for toleration and excise, septennial Parliaments and standing armies, presided at Quarter Sessions, and became deputy-lieutenants."

In attacking the Whigs my object is certainly not to favor the Tories, but to rectify the delusion that the Whigs have always been friends to liberty and progress.

Although George I brought with him no wife to England, he was accompanied by at least two of his mistresses, and our peerage roll was enriched by the addition of Madame Kielmansegge as Countess of Darlington, and Mademoiselle Erangard Melosine de Schulenberg as Duchess of Kendal and Munster, Baroness of Glastonbury, and Countess of Faversham. These peeresses were received with high favor by the Whig aristocracy, although the Tories refused to countenance them, and "they were often hooted by the mob as they passed through the streets". The *Edinburgh Review* described them as "two big blowsy German women". Here I have no room to deal fairly with Charlotte Sophia, Baroness of Brentford and Countess of Darlington; her title is extinct, and I can write nothing of any good or useful act to revive her memory. Lord Chesterfield says of George I: "No woman came amiss to him, if she were only very willing and very fat." John Heneage Jesse, in his "Memoirs of the Court of England,"—speaking of the Duchess of Kendal, the Countess Platen, (the co-partner in the murder of Konigsmark), and many others less known to infamy—declares that George I "had the folly and wickedness to encumber himself with a seraglio of hideous German prostitutes". The Duchess of Kendal was for many years the chief mistress of George, and being tall and lean, was caricatured as the Maypole or the Giraffe. She had a pension of £7,500 a year, the profits of the place of Master of the Horse, besides much other plunder from

the national purse. The secret correspondence of the French ambassador with Louis XV justifies the belief that the Duchess was secretly employed and paid to betray to the French Court the State secrets learned by her from King George. De Broglie writes: "The king visits her every afternoon from five to eight, and it is there she endeavors to penetrate the sentiments of his Britannic Majesty". Mr. Molloy says: "The marks of confidence bestowed on her in private for the maintenance of the union between the two countries must have been pretty considerable. But the French king was not the only foreign power which sought to keep this notorious woman in its favor. The Emperor of Austria, who was desirous that King George should renew the connexion between England and Austria, kept up a secret correspondence with her." The Countess of Darlington's figure may be judged from the name of Elephant or Camel popularly awarded to her. Horace Walpole writes: "I remember as a boy being terrified at her enormous figure. The fierce black eyes, large and rolling, between two lofty-arched eyebrows, two acres of cheeks spread with crimson, an ocean of neck that overflowed, and was not distinguished from the lower part of her body, and no part restrained by stays. No wonder that a child dreaded such an ogress." She died in 1724. Mahon says: "She was unwieldy in person, and rapacious in character".

Phillimore declares that "George I brought with him from Hanover mistresses as rapacious, and satellites as ignoble, as those which drew down such deserved obloquy on Charles II. Bethman, Bernstoff, Robethon, and two Turks—Mustapha and Mahomet—meddled more with public affairs, and were to the full as venal as Chiffin, Pepys, and Smith." Mahon, who calls Robethon a "prying impertinent venomous creature", adds that "coming from a poor Electorate, a flight of hungry Hanoverians, like so many famished vultures, fell with keen eyes and bended talons on the fruitful soil of England".

One of the earliest acts of the Whig aristocracy, under George I, was to pass a measure through Parliament lengthening the existence of that very Parliament to seven years, and giving to the King the power to continue all subsequent

Parliaments to a like period. The Triennial Parliaments were thus lengthened by a corrupt majority. For the committal of the Septennial Bill there was a majority of seventy-two votes, and it is alleged by the *Westminster Review* "that about eighty-two members of the honorable House had either fingered Walpole's gold, or pocketed the bank notes which, by the purest accident, were left under their plates. . . . In the ten years which preceded the Septennial Act the sum expended in Secret Service money was £337,960. In the ten years which followed the passing of the Septennial Act the sum expended for Secret Service was £1,453,400." The same writer says: "The friends and framers of the Triennial Bill were for the most part Tories, and its opponents for the most part Whigs. The framers and friends of the Bill for long Parliaments were all Whigs, and its enemies all Tories." When the measure came before the Lords we find Baron Bernstoff, on the King's behalf, actually canvassing Peers' wives with promises of places for their relatives, in order to induce them to get their husbands to vote for the Bill. Another of the early infringements of public liberty by the Whig supporters of George I was the passing (1 Geo. I, stat. 2, c. 5) of the Riot Act, which had not existed from the accession of James I to the death of Queen Anne. Sir John Hinde Cotton, a few years afterwards, described this Act, which is still the law of England, as "An Act by which a little dirty justice of the peace, the meanest and vilest tool a minister can use, had it in his power to put twenty or thirty of the best subjects of England to immediate death, without any trial or form but that of reading a proclamation". In order to facilitate the King's desire to spend most of his time in Hanover, the third section of the Act of Settlement was repealed.

Thackeray says: "Delightful as London City was, King George I liked to be out of it as much as ever he could, and when there, passed all his time with his Germans. It was with them as with Blücher one hundred years afterwards, when the bold old Reiter looked down from St. Paul's and sighed out 'Was für Plunder!' The German women plundered, the German secretaries plundered, the German cooks and intendants

plundered ; even Mustapha and Mahomet, the German negroes, had a share of the booty. Take what you can get, was the old monarch's maxim."

There was considerable discontent in the early years of George's reign. Hallam says : " Much of this disaffection was owing to the cold reserve of George I, ignorant of the language, alien to the prejudices of his people, and continually absent in his electoral dominions, to which he seemed to sacrifice the nation's interest. . . . The letters in Cox's 'Memoirs of Walpole' abundantly show the German nationality, the impolicy and neglect of his duties, the rapacity and petty selfishness of George I. The Whigs were much dissatisfied, but the fear of losing their places made them his slaves." In order to add the duchies of Bremen and Verden to Hanover, in 1716, the King, as elector, made a treaty with Denmark against Sweden. This treaty proved the source of those Continental wars, and the attendant system of subsidies to European Powers, which have in the main created our enormous National Debt ; Bremen and Verden being actually purchased for George I, as the Elector of Hanover, with English money. Great Britain, in addition, was pledged by George I to guarantee Schleswig to Denmark. Sweden and Denmark quarrelling—and George I as Elector of Hanover having, without the consent of the English Parliament, declared war against Sweden—an English fleet was sent into the Baltic to take up a quarrel with which we had no concern. In addition, we were involved in a quarrel with Russia, because that Power had interfered to prevent Mecklenberg being added to George's Hanoverian estates. The chief mover in this was the notorious Baron Bernstoff, who held some village property in Mecklenberg. In all these complications, Hanover gained, England lost. If Hanover found troops, England paid for them, while the Electorate solely reaped the benefit. Every thoughtful writer admits that English interests were always betrayed to satisfy Hanoverian greed.

The King's fondness for Germany provoked bitter expressions of hostility, and amongst the various squibs issued, one in 1716, from the pen of Samuel Wesley, brother of John

Wesley, represents a conversation between George and the Duchess of Kendal :

" As soon as the wind it came fairly about,
That kept the king in and his enemies out,
He determined no longer confinement to bear ;
And thus to the Duchess his mind did declare :

" Quoth he, ' My dear Kenny, I've been tired a long while,
With living obscure in this poor little isle,
And now Spain and Pretender have no more mines to spring,
I'm resolved to go home and live like a king ' . "

The Duchess approves of this, describes and laughs at all the persons nominated for the Council of Regency, and concludes :

" ' On the whole I'll be hanged if all over the realm
There are thirteen such fools to be put to the helm !
So for this time be easy, nor have jealous thought,
They ha'n't sense to sell you, nor are worth being bought. ' "

" ' 'Tis for that (quoth the King, in very bad French),
I chose them for my regents and you for my wench.
And neither, I'm sure, will my trust e'er betray,
For the devil won't take you if I turn you away ' . "

It was this same Duchess of Kendal who, being the King's mistress, was publicly accused of having received enormous sums of money from the South Sea Company for herself and the King, in order to shield from justice the principal persons connected with those terrible South Sea frauds, by which in the year 1720, so many families were reduced to misery.

When the " South Sea Bill ", was promoted in 1720, wholesale bribery was resorted to. Transfers of stocks were proved to have been made to persons in high office. Two members of the Whig Ministry, Lord Sunderland and Mr. Aislabie, were so implicated that they had to resign their offices, and the last-named, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer, was ignominiously expelled the House of Commons. Royalty itself, or at least, the King's sultanas, and several of his German household, shared the spoil. £30,000 were traced to the King's mistresses, and a Select Committee of the House denounced the whole business as " a train of the deepest villainy and fraud with which hell ever contrived to

ruin a nation". Near the close of the reign Lord Macclesfield, Lord Chancellor and favorite and tool of the King, was impeached for extortion and abuse of trust in his office, and, being convicted, was sentenced to pay a fine of £30,000. In 1716 Mademoiselle. Schulenberg, then Duchess of Munster, received £5,000 as a bribe for procuring the title of Viscount for Sir Henry St. John. In 1724, the same peeress, bribed by Lord Bolingbroke, successfully used her influence to pass an Act through Parliament restoring him his forfeited estates. Remusat says that the Duchess was paid for this £11,000, and that she obtained a promise from the King which Walpole dared not, or could not, make the King retract. Lady Cowper tells us that Mr. Chetwynd, in order to secure his position in the Board of Trade, paid to another of George's mistresses £500 down, agreed to allow her £200 a year as long as he held the place, and gave her also the fine brilliant earrings she wore.

In 1717, Mr. Shippen, a member of the House of Commons, was committed to the Tower for saying in his place in the House that it was the "infelicity of His Majesty's reign that he is unacquainted with our language and constitution". Lord Macaulay tells us how Lord Carteret, afterwards Earl Granville, rose into favor. The king could speak no English; Carteret was the only one of the Ministry who could speak German. "All the communication that Walpole had with his master was in very bad Latin." The influence Carteret wielded over the King did not, however, extend to every member of the Royal Family. The Princess of Wales afterwards described the Lords Carteret and Bolingbroke as men she had "long known to be two as worthless men of parts as any in the country, and who I have not only been often told are two of the greatest liars and knaves in any country, but whom my own observation and experience have found so".

Under pressure from George I our standing army was nearly doubled by the Whig Ministry, and this when peace would rather have justified a reduction than an increase. The payments to Hanoverian troops commenced under this king, a payment which William Pitt afterwards earned the enmity of

George II by very sharply denouncing, and which payment was but a step in the system of continental subsidies which helped to swell our national debt.

In this reign the enclosure of waste lands was practically commenced, sixteen enclosure Acts being passed, and 17,660 acres of land enclosed. This example was followed in the next reign with increasing rapidity, 226 enclosure Acts being passed in the reign of George II, under which 318,778 acres of land were enclosed. As Mr. Fawcett states, up to 1845 more than 7,000,000 acres of land, over which the public possessed invaluable rights, have been gradually absorbed, and individuals wielding legislative influence have been enriched at the expense of the public and the poor.

Within six years from his accession the King was about £600,000 in debt, and this sum was the first of a long list of debts discharged by the nation for these Brunswicks. When our ministers to-day talk of obligations on the part of the people to endow each additional member of the Royal Family, the memory of these shameful extravagances should have some effect. George I had a civil list of £700,000 a year. He received £300,000 from the Royal Exchange Assurance Company, and £300,000 from the London assurance companies, and had one million voted to him in 1726 towards payment of his debts.

In 1724 there appeared in Dublin the first of the famous "Drapier Letters", written by Jonathan Swift against Wood's coinage patent. A patent had been granted to a man named Wood for coining half-pence in Ireland. This grant was made under the influence of the Duchess of Kendal, and on the stipulation that she should receive a large share of the profits. These "Drapier Letters" were prosecuted by the Government, but Swift followed them with others; the grand juries refused to find true bills, and ultimately the patent was cancelled. Wood, or the Duchess, got as compensation a grant of a pension of £3,000 a year for eight years.

George died at Osnabrück, on his journey Hanoverwards, in June, 1727, having made a will by which he disposed of his money in some fashion displeasing to his son George II; and,

as the *Edinburgh Review* tells us, the latter "evaded the old King's directions, and got his money by burning his will". In this George II only followed his Royal father's example. When Sophia Dorothea died she left a will bequeathing her property in a fashion displeasing to George I, who, without scruple, destroyed the testament and appropriated the estate. George I had also previously burned the will of his father-in-law, the Duke of Zelle. At this time the destruction of a will was a capital felony in England.

The accession of George I meant the triumph of the Protestant caste in Ireland, and under his rule much was done to render permanent the utter hatred manifested by the Irish people to their English conquerors, who had always preferred the policy of extermination to that of conciliation. Things were so sad in Ireland at the end of this reign that Dean Swift, in bitter mockery, "wrote and published his 'Modest Proposal' for relieving the miseries of the people by cooking and eating the children of the poor"—"a piece of the fiercest sarcasm," says Mitchell, "steeped in all the concentrated bitterness of his soul". Poor Ireland! she had, at any rate, nothing to endear to her the memory of George I.

CHAPTER III.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE II.

When George I died there was so little interest or affection exhibited by his son and successor that Sir Robert Walpole, on announcing to George II that by the demise of his father he had succeeded to regal honors, was saluted with a volley of oaths, and "Dat is one big lie". No pretence of sorrow was even made. George Augustus had hated George Lewis during life, and at the first council, when the will of the late King was produced by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the new monarch simply took it up and walked out of the room with the document, which was never seen again. Thackeray, who pictures George II as "a dull, little man, of low tastes," says that he "made away with his father's will under the astonished nose of the Archbishop of Canterbury". A duplicate of this will having been deposited with the Duke of Brunswick, a large sum of money was paid to that Prince nominally as a subsidy by the English Government for the maintenance of troops, but really as a bribe for surrendering the document. A legacy having been left by this will to Lady Walsingham, threats were held out in 1733, by her then husband, Lord Chesterfield, and £20,000 were paid in compromise.

The eldest son of George II was Frederick, born in 1706, and who up to 1728 resided permanently in Hanover. Lord Hervey tells us that the king hated his son Frederick, and that the Queen Caroline, his mother, abhorred him. To Lord Hervey the Queen says: "My dear Lord, I will give it you under my hand, if you are in any fear of my relapsing, that my dear first-born is the greatest ass, and the greatest liar, and the greatest *canaille*, and the greatest beast in the whole world; and that I most heartily wish he were out of it." Allowing for a royal mother's love for her child, this is a tolerably strong

description of the father of George III, from the lips of his own mother. Along with this description of Frederick by the Queen, take Thackeray's character of George II, worthy father of worthy son: "Here was one who had neither dignity, learning, morals, nor wit—who tainted a great society by a bad example; who in youth, manhood, and old age, was gross, low, and sensual."

In 1705, when only Electoral Prince of Hanover, George had married Caroline, daughter of the Margrave of Anspach, a woman of more than average ability. Thackeray describes Caroline in high terms of praise, but Lord Chesterfield says that "she valued herself upon skill in simulation and dissimulation. . . . Cunning and perfidy were the means she made use of in business." The Prince of Anspach is alleged by the *Whisperer* to have raised some difficulties as to the marriage, on account of George I being disposed to deny the legitimacy of his son, and it is further pretended that George I had actually to make distinct acknowledgment of his son to King William III before the arrangements for the Act of Settlement were consented to by that king. It is quite clear from the diary of Lady Cowper, that the old King's feeling towards George II was always one of the most bitter hatred.

The influence exercised by Queen Caroline over George II was purely political; and Lord Hervey declares that "wherever the interest of Germany and the honor of the Empire were concerned, her thoughts and reasoning were as German and imperial as if England had been out of the question".

A strange story is told of Sir Robert Walpole and Caroline. Sir Robert, when intriguing for office under George I, with Townshend, Devonshire, and others, objected to their plans being communicated to the Prince of Wales, saying, "The fat b——h, his wife, would betray the secret and spoil the project". This courtly speech being made known by some kind friend to the Princess Caroline, considerable hostility was naturally exhibited. Sir Robert Walpole, who held the doctrine that every person was purchasable, the only question being one of price, managed to purchase peace with Caroline when Queen. When the ministry suspended, "Walpole not fairly out,

Compton not fairly in," Sir Robert assured the Queen that he would secure her an annuity of £100,000 in the event of the King's death; Sir Spencer Compton, who was then looked on as likely to be in power, had only offered £60,000. The Queen sent back word, "Tell Sir Robert, the fat b——h has forgiven him," and thenceforth they were political allies until the Queen's death in 1737.

The domestic relations of George II were marvellous. We pass with little notice Lady Suffolk, Lady-in-waiting to the Queen and mistress to the King, who was sold by her husband for a pension of £1,200 a year, paid by the British taxpayers, and who was coarsely insulted by both their majesties. It is needless to dwell on the confidential communications, in which "that stuttering little sultan George II," as Thackeray calls him, solicited favors from his wife for his mistress, the Countess of Walmoden; but to use the words of the cultured *Edinburgh Review*, the Queen's "actual intercession to secure for the King the favors of the Duchess of Modena, precludes the idea that these sentiments were as revolting to the royal Philamante as they would now-a-days be to a scavenger's daughter. Nor was the Queen the only lady of the Royal Family who talked openly on these matters. When Lady Suffolk was waning at court, the Princess Royal could find nothing better to say than this: 'I wish with all my heart that he (*i.e.* the King) would take somebody else, that mamma might be relieved from the *ennui* of seeing him for ever in her room.'

Lady Cowper actually tells us that George II, when Prince of Wales, intrigued with Lady Walpole, not only with the knowledge of the Princess Caroline, but also with connivance of the Prime Minister himself. Lord Hervey adds that Caroline used to sneer at Sir Robert Walpole, asking how the poor man—"avec ce gros corps, ces jambes enflées et ce vilain ventre"—could possibly believe that any woman could love him for himself, and that Sir Robert retaliated, when Caroline afterwards complained to him of the King's cross temper, by telling her very coolly that "it was impossible it could be otherwise, since the King had tasted better things," and ended by advising her to bring pretty Lady Tankerville *en rapport* with the King.

In 1727, an act was passed, directed against workmen in the woollen trade, rendering combination for the purpose of raising wages unlawful. Some years afterwards, this Act was extended to other trades, and the whole tendency of the Septennial Parliament legislation manifested a most unfortunate desire on the part of the Legislature to coerce and keep in subjection the artisan classes.

In February, 1728, the celebrated "Beggar's Opera," by Gay, was put on the stage at the Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre, and being supposed to contain some satirical reflections on court-corruption, provoked much displeasure on the part of Royalty. The Duchess of Queensborough, who patronised Gay, being forbidden to attend court, wrote thus: "The Duchess of Queensborough is suprised and well-pleased that the King has given her so agreeable a command as forbidding her the court. . . . She hopes that, by so unprecedented an order as this, the King will see as few as she wishes at his court, particularly such as dare speak or think truth." Authors and actors were probably more outspoken in this reign than at any other period of English history.

In 1729, £115,000 was voted by Parliament for the payment of the King's debts. This vote seems to have been obtained under false pretences to benefit the King, whose "cardinal passion", says Phillimore, "was avarice".

The *Craftsman*, during the first decade of the reign, fiercely assailed the Whig Ministry for "a wasteful expenditure of money in foreign subsidies and bribes"; and in his place in the House of Commons William Pitt, "the great Commoner," in the strongest language attacked the system of foreign bribery by which home corruption was supplemented.

The rapidly-increasing expenditure needed increased taxation, and a caricature published in 1732 marks the public feeling. A monster (Excise), in the form of a many-headed dragon, is drawing the Minister (Sir Robert Walpole) in his coach, and pouring into his lap, in the shape of gold, what it has swallowed up in the forms of mutton, hams, cups, glasses, mugs, pipes, etc.

" See this dragon Excise
Has ten thousand eyes,
And five thousand mouths to devour us ;

A sting and sharp claws,
 With wide gaping jaws,
 And a belly as big as a store-house."

Beginning with wines and liquors—

" Grant these and the glutton
 Will roar out for mutton,
 Your beef, bread, and bacon to boot ;
 Your goose, pig, and pullet,
 He'll thrust down his gullet,
 Whilst the laborer munches a root."

In 1730, Mr. Sandys introduced a Bill to disable pensioners from sitting in Parliament. George II vigorously opposed this measure, which was defeated. In the King's private notes to Lord Townshend, Mr. Sandys' proposed Act is termed a "villainous measure", which should be "torn to pieces in every particular".

It was in 1732 that the Earl of Aylesford, a Tory peer, declared that standing armies in times of peace were "against the very words of the *Petition of Rights*", and that "the confusions and disorders which have been brought upon this kingdom for many years have been all brought upon it by means of standing armies". In 1733 Earl Strafford affirmed that "a standing army" was "always inconsistent with the liberties of the people", and urged that "where the people have any regard for their liberties they ought never to keep up a greater number of regular forces than are absolutely necessary for the security of the Government". Sir John Barnard declared that the army ought not to be used on political questions. He said: "In a free country, if a tumult happens from a just cause of complaint, the people ought to be satisfied: their grievances ought to be redressed; they ought not surely to be immediately knocked on the head because they may happen to complain in an irregular way". Mr. Pulteney urged that a standing army is "a body of men distinct from the body of the people; they are governed by different laws; blind obedience and an entire submission to the orders of their commanding officer is their only principle. The nations around us are already enslaved by those very means; by means of their standing armies they have every one lost their liberties; it is

indeed impossible that the liberties of the people can be preserved in a country where a numerous standing army is kept up”.

In 1735 sixteen Scottish peers were elected to the House of Lords, and in a petition to Parliament it was alleged that the whole of these sixteen peers were elected by bribery and corruption. The petition positively asserted: “That the list of sixteen peers for Scotland had been formed by persons high in trust under the Crown previous to the election itself. The peers were solicited to vote for this list without the liberty of making any alteration, and endeavors were used to engage peers to vote for this list by promise of pensions and offices, civil and military, to themselves and their relations, and by actual promise and offers of sums of money. Several had received money, and releases of debts owing to the Crown were granted to those who voted for this list. To render this transaction more infamous, a battalion of troops occupied the Abbey Court of Edinburgh, and continued there during the whole time of the election, while there was a considerable body lying within a mile of the city ready to advance on the signal.” This petition, notwithstanding the gravity of its allegations, was quietly suppressed.

Lady Sandon, Woman of the Bedchamber and Mistress of the Robes to Queen Caroline, received from Lord Pomfret jewellery of £1,400 value, for obtaining him the appointment of Master of the Horse.

With a Civil List of £800,000 a year, George II was continually in debt, but an obedient Ministry and a corrupt Parliament never hesitated to discharge his Majesty’s obligations out of the pockets of the unrepresented people. Lord Carteret, in 1733, speaking of a Bill before the House for granting the King half-a-million out of the Sinking Fund, said: “This Fund, my Lords, has been clandestinely defrauded of several small sums at different times, which indeed together amount to a pretty large sum; but by this Bill it is to be openly and avowedly plundered of £500,000 at once.”

On the 27th of April, 1736, Prince Frederick was married to the Princess Augusta of Saxe Gotha, whom King George II

afterwards described as "*cette diablesse Madame la Princesse*". In August of the same year a sharp open quarrel took place between the Prince of Wales and his parents, which, after some resumptions of pretended friendliness, ended on September 10th, 1737, in the former being ordered by the King to quit St. James's Palace, where he was residing. On the 22nd of the preceding February, Pulteney had moved for an allowance of £100,000 a year to Prince Frederick. George II refused to consent, on the ground that the responsibility to provide for the Prince of Wales rested with himself, and that "it would be highly indecorous to interfere between father and son". On the Prince of Wales taking up his residence at Norfolk House, "the King issued an order that no persons who paid their court to the Prince and Princess should be admitted to his presence". An official intimation of this was given to foreign ambassadors.

On the 20th of November, 1737, Queen Caroline died, never having spoken to her son since the quarrel. "She was," says Walpole, "implacable in hatred even to her dying moments. She absolutely refused to pardon, or even to see, her son." The death-bed scene is thus spoken of by Thackeray: "There never was such a ghastly farce." As sketched by Lord Hervey, it is a monstrous mixture of religion, disgusting comedy, and brutishness: "We are shocked in the very chamber of death by the intrusion of egoism, vanity, buffoonery, and inhumanity. The King is at one moment dissolved in a mawkish tenderness, at another sunk in a brutal apathy. He is at one moment all tears for the loss of one who united the softness and amiability of one sex to the courage and firmness of the other; at another, all fury, because the object of his regrets cannot swallow, or cannot change her posture, or cannot animate the glassy fixedness of her eyes; at one moment he begins an elaborate panegyric on her virtues, then breaks off into an enumeration of his own, by which he implies that her heart has been enthralled and her intelligence awed. He then breaks off into a stupid story about a storm, for which his daughter laughs at him, and then, while he is weeping over his consort's death-bed, she advises him to marry again; and we are—what the Queen

was not—startled by the strange reply, '*Non, j'aurai des maitresses*', with the faintly-moaned-out rejoinder, '*Cela n'empêche pas*.' So does the *Edinburgh Reviewer*, following Lord Hervey, paint the dying scene of the Queen of our second George.

After the death of the Queen, the influence of the King's Mistress became supreme, and Sir R. Walpole, who in losing Queen Caroline had lost his greatest hold over George, paid court to Lady Walmoden, in order to maintain his weakened influence. In the private letters of the Pelham family, who succeeded to power soon after Walpole's fall, we find frequent mention of the Countess of Yarmouth as a power to be gained, a person to stand well with. "I read," says Thackeray, "that Lady Yarmouth (my most religious and gracious King's favorite) sold a bishopric to a clergyman for £5,000. (He betted her £5,000 that he would not be made a bishop, and he lost, and paid her.) Was he the only prelate of his time led up by such hands for consecration? As I peep into George II's St. James's, I see crowds of cassocks rustling up the back-stairs of the ladies of the Court; stealthy clergy slipping purses into their laps; that godless old king yawning under his canopy in his Chapel Royal, as the chaplain before him is discouraging."

On the 23rd of May, 1738, George William Frederick, son of Frederick, and afterwards George III, was born.

In 1739 Lady Walmoden, who had up to this year remained in Hanover, was brought to England and formally installed at the English Court. In this year we bound ourselves by treaty to pay 250,000 dollars per annum, for three years, to the Danish Government. "The secret motive of this treaty," says Mahon, "as of too many others, was not English, but Hanoverian, and regarded the possession of a petty castle and lordship called Steinhorst. This castle had been bought from Holstein by George II as elector of Hanover, but the Danes claiming the sovereignty, a skirmish ensued. . . . The well-timed treaty of subsidy calmed their resentment, and obtained the cession of their claim." Many urged, as in truth it was, that Steinhorst was bought with British money, and Bolingbroke expressed his fear: "that we shall throw the small remainder of our wealth

where we have thrown so much already, into the German Gulf, which cries, Give ! Give ! and is never satisfied”.

On the 19th of May, 1739, in accordance with the wish of the King, war was declared with Spain, nominally on the question of the right of search ; but when peace was declared at Aix-la-Chapelle, this subject was never mentioned. According to Dr. Colquhoun, this war cost the country £46,418,680. The actual naval and military expenditure during the war was £62,077,642.

George II was continually in Hanover. From 1729 to 1731, again in 1735 and 1736, and eight times between 1740 and 1755. In 1745 he wished to go, but was not allowed.

On the 2nd of October, 1741 (the Pelham family having managed to acquire power by dint, as Lord Macaulay puts it, of more than suspected treason to their leader and colleague), the Duke of Newcastle, then Prime Minister, wrote his brother, Henry Pelham, as follows : “ I must freely own to you that I think the King’s unjustifiable partiality for Hanover, to which he makes all other wishes and considerations subservient, has manifested itself so much that no man can continue in the active part of the administration with honor”. The Duke goes on to describe the King’s policy as “ both dishonorable and fatal ” ; and Henry Pelham, on the 8th of October, writes him back that “ a partiality to Hanover in general is what all men of business have found great obstructions from, ever since this family have been upon the throne”. Yet these are amongst the most prominent of the public defenders of the House of Brunswick, and belong to a family which reaped great place and profit from the connexion.

In 1742, under the opposition of Pulteney, the Tories called upon Paxton, the Solicitor to the Treasury, and Scrope, the Secretary to the Treasury, to account for the specific sum of £1,147,211, which it was proved they had received from the minister. No account was ever furnished. George Vaughan, a confidant of Sir Robert Walpole, was examined before the Commons as to a practice charged upon that minister, of obliging the possessor of a place or office to pay a certain sum out of the profits of it to some person or persons recommended by the minister. Vaughan, who does not appear to have ventured any

direct denial, managed to avoid giving a categorical reply, and to get excused from answering on the ground that he might criminate himself. Agitation was commenced for the revival of Triennial Parliaments, for the renewal of the clause of the Act of Settlement by which pensioners and placemen were excluded from the House of Commons, and for the abolition of standing armies in time of peace. The Whigs, however, successfully crushed out the whole of this agitation. Strong language was heard in the House of Commons, where Sir James Dashwood said that "it was no wonder that the people were then unwilling to support the Government, when a weak, narrow-minded prince occupied the throne".

A very amusing squib appeared in 1742, when Sir Robert Walpole's power was giving way, partly under the bold attacks of the Tories, led by Cotton and Shippen: partly before the malcontent Whigs, under the guidance of Carteret and Pulteney; partly before the rising power of the Young England party led by William Pitt; and somewhat from the jealousy, if not treachery of his colleague, the Duke of Newcastle. The squib pictures the King's embarrassment and anger at being forced to dismiss Walpole, and to Carteret whom he has charged to form a ministry:—

"Quoth the King: 'My good lord, perhaps you've been told
That I used to abuse you a little of old;
But now bring whom you will, and eke turn away,
Let but me and my money at Walmoden stay'."

Lord Carteret explaining to the King whom he shall keep of the old ministry, includes the Duke of Newcastle:—

"Though Newcastle's false, as he's silly I know,
By betraying old Robin to me long ago,
As well as all those who employed him before,
Yet I leave him in place, but I leave him no power.

"For granting his heart is as black as his hat,
With no more truth than there's sense beneath that,
Yet, as he's a coward, he'll shake when I frown;
You call'd him a rascal, I'll use him like one.

"For your foreign affairs, howe'er they turn out,
At least I'll take care that you shall make a great rout:
Then cock your great hat, strut, bounce, and look bluff,
For though kick'd and cuff'd here, you shall there kick and cuff.

"That Walpole did nothing they all used to say,
 So I'll do enough, but I'll make the dogs pay;
 Great fleets I'll provide, and great armies engage,
 Whate'er debts we make, or whate'er wars we wage!

"With cordials like these the monarch's new guest
 Reviv'd his sunk spirits, and gladden'd his breast;
 Till in rapture he cried, 'My dear Lord you shall do
 Whatever you will—give me troops to review'."

In 1743, King George II actually tried to engage this country, by a private agreement, to pay £300,000 a year to the Queen of Hungary, "as long as war should continue, or the necessity of her affairs should require". The King, being at Hanover, sent over the treaty to England, with a warrant directing the Lords Justices to "ratify and confirm it", which, however, they refused to do. On hearing that the Lord Chancellor refused to sanction the arrangement, King George II threatened, through Earl Granville, to affix the great seal with his own hand. Ultimately, the £300,000 per annum was agreed to be paid so long as the war lasted, but this sum was in more than one instance exceeded.

Although George II had induced the country to vote such large sums to Maria Theresa, the Empress-Queen, he nevertheless abandoned her in a most cowardly manner, when he thought his Hanoverian dominions in danger, and actually treated with France without the knowledge or consent of his Ministry.

The final result of all these subsidy votes was to increase our national debt, up to the signing of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, to £76,000,000; while the Seven Years War, which came later, brought the debt to £133,000,000, not including in this the capitalised value of the terminable annuities.

On November, 22nd 1743, a caricature was published, which had a wide sale, and which represented the King as a fat Hanoverian white horse riding to death a nearly starved British lion.

In 1744, £200,000 was voted, which King George and Lord Carteret, who was called by William Pitt his "Hanoverian troop minister", had agreed to give the King of Sardinia. £440,000 was also voted for a payment made by the King to

the Duke of Arenberg. This payment was denounced by Mr. Lyttleton as a dangerous misapplication of public money.

The votes for foreign subsidies alone, in 1744, were £691,426, while the Hanoverian soldiers cost us £393,773. The King actually tried in addition, in the month of August, to get a further subsidy for his friend the Elector of Saxony, and another for the King of Poland, and this when Englishmen and Irishmen were lacking bread. Nor was even a pretence made in some instances of earning the money. £150,000 was paid this year to keep Prince Charles in Alsace, and the moment Austria got the money, Prince Charles was withdrawn; and Henry Pelham, writing to the Duke of Newcastle says: "The same will be the case with every sum of money we advance. The allies will take it, and then act as suits their convenience and security." In the four years from 1744 to 1747, both included, we paid £4,342,683 for foreign troops and subsidies, not including the Dutch and Hessians, hired to put down the rebellion of 1745. In the whole of this war, in which we subsidised all our allies except the Dutch, it is clear that the direct and sole blame rests upon the King, who cared nothing for English interests in the matter. When firmly remonstrated with by Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, his reply was what the Duke of Newcastle describes as "almost sullen silence".

For the rebellion of 1745—which came so near being successful, and which would have thoroughly succeeded had the Pretender's son possessed any sort of ability as a leader—there is little room to spare here. The attempt to suppress it in its early stages is thus described in a Jacobite ballad:—

"Horse, foot, and dragoons, from lost Flanders they call,
With Hessians and Danes, and the Devil and all;
And hunters and rangers led by Oglethorpe;
And the Church at the bum of the Bishop of York.
And, pray, who so fit to lead forth this parade
As the babe of Tanger, my old grandmother Wade?
Whose cunning's so quick, but whose motion's so slow,
That the rebels marched on while he stuck in the snow."

The hideously disgusting cruelties and horrible excesses committed by the infamous Duke of Cumberland and the

Hessians and Hanoverians under his command in suppressing the rebellion after the battle of Culloden are too well known. Duncan Forbes, Lord President of the Court of Session, and a warm supporter of the Brunswicks, remonstrating with the Duke as to the latter's disregard for the laws of the country, his Royal Highness of Cumberland replied with an oath: "The laws of my country, my lord! I'll make a brigade give laws." Scotland has many reasons for loving the House of Brunswick. There was but little love between the Royal Princes. Lord Waldegrave, who strove hard to whitewash the Duke of Cumberland, says that "Frederick Prince of Wales gave too much credit to the most malignant and groundless accusations by showing favor to every man who aspersed his brother's character."

In 1747, £456,734 was voted by Parliament for the payment of the King's debts.

In 1748, considerable difficulty arose in consequence of the King's intrigues to obtain, at the expense of England, the Bishopric of Osnaburg as a princely establishment for his favorite son, the Duke of Cumberland, that pious prince, much esteemed in Scotland as the "butcher." The most open hostility was manifested between the Duke of Cumberland and Prince Frederick, and pamphleteering attacks on the former, for his brutality and excesses, were supposed to be encouraged by the Leicester House party.

Amongst the curious scandals of 1749, it is stated that the King—being present at a masked ball, at which Elizabeth Chudleigh, afterwards Duchess of Kingston, figured as "La Belle Sauvage" in a close-fitting dress of flesh-colored silk—requested permission to place his hand on Miss Chudleigh's breast. The latter replied that she would put the King's hand on a still softer place, and immediately raised it to his own royal forehead.

On the 20th of March, 1758, Frederick Prince of Wales died. The King, who received the news while playing cards with his mistress, Lady Yarmouth, and who had not spoken to his son for years, merely said: "Freddy is dead."

On this subject Thackeray preserves for us the following epitaph:—

" Here lies Fred,
Who was alive, and is dead,
Had it been his father,
I had much rather.
Had it been his brother,
Still better than another.
Had been his sister,
No one would have missed her.
Had it been the whole generation,
Still better for the nation.
But since 'tis only Fred,
Who was alive, and is dead,
There's no more to be said."

In 1755, there was the second war, the military expenditure for which was £104,611,374. In this George II pursued exactly the opposite course of policy to that taken by him in the previous one. The war during the years following 1739 was for the humiliation of the King of Prussia; the policy in the last war was to prevent his humiliation. Mr. Baxter estimates the debt (exclusive of annuities) at £133,000,000: Dr. Colquhoun, adding the value of the annuities, makes it £146,682,843 at the conclusion of this war.

Towards the close of the reign of George II, who died on October 25th, 1760, his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, by an exhibition of great strategy, combined with much discretionary valor, succeeded in making peace on terms which ensured the repose of himself and his Hanoverian forces during the remainder of the war. At home his Royal Highness was much attacked, some venturing to describe his personal conduct as cowardly, and his generalship as contemptible. It is a sufficient refutation of such a calumny to say that the Duke of Cumberland was as brave a soldier and as able a general as our present Commander-in-Chief, his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge.

Lord Waldegrave, who wrote in favor of George II, admits that the King "is accused by his ministers of being hasty and passionate when any measure is proposed which he does not approve of". That "too great attention to money seems to be

his capital failing". And that "his political courage seems somewhat problematical". Phillimore puts it more strongly: "In public life he was altogether indifferent to the welfare of England, except as it affected his Electorate's or his own. Always purchasing concubines, he was always governed by his wife. In private life he was a gross lover, an unreasonable master, a coarsely unfaithful husband, an unnatural parent, and a selfish man."

No more fitting conclusion can be found to this chapter than the following pregnant words from Macaulay: "At the close of the reign of George II the feeling of aversion with which the House of Brunswick had long been regarded by half the nation had died away; but no feeling of affection to that House had yet sprung up. There was little, indeed, in the old King's character to inspire esteem or tenderness. He was not our countryman. He never set foot on our soil till he was more than thirty years old. His speech betrayed his foreign origin and breeding. His love for his native land, though the most amiable part of his character, was not likely to endear him to his British subjects. He was never so happy as when he could exchange St. James's for Heranhausen. Year after year our fleets were employed to convoy him to the Continent, and the interests of his kingdom were as nothing to him when compared with the interests of his Electorate. As to the rest, he had neither the qualities which make dullness respectable, nor the qualities which make libertinism attractive. He had been a bad son and a worse father, an unfaithful husband and an ungrateful lover. Not one magnanimous or humane action is recorded of him, but many instances of meanness, and of a harshness which, but for the strong constitutional restraints under which he was placed, might have made the misery of his people."

CHAPTER IV.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE III.

When George II died, his grandson and successor, George III, was twenty-two years of age. The Civil List of the new King was fixed at £800,000 a year—"a provision," says Phillimore, in his "History of England", "that soon became inadequate to the clandestine purposes of George III, and for the purchase of the mercenary dependants, on the support of whom his unconstitutional proceedings obliged him to depend". The Civil List of George III was not, however, really so large as that of her present Majesty. The Civil List disbursements included such items as Secret Service, now charged separately; pensions and annuities, now charged separately; diplomatic salaries, now forming distinct items; fees and salaries of ministers and judges, now forming no part of the charge against the Civil List. So that though £924,041 was the Civil List of George III four years after he ascended the throne, in truth to-day the Royal Family alone get much more than all the great offices and machinery of State then cost. The Royal Family alone at the present time get from the country, avowedly and secretly, that is, either paid to them or paid for them, a sum exceeding that allowed to George I for the whole Civil Government.

"At the accession of George III," writes Thackeray, "the Patricians were yet at the height of their own fortune. Society recognised their superiority, which they themselves pretty calmly took for granted. They inherited not only titles and estates, and seats in the House of Peers, but seats in the House of Commons. There were a multitude of Government places, and not merely these, but bribes of actual £500 notes, which members of the House took not much shame in assuming. Fox went into Parliament at twenty, Pitt was just

of age, his father not much older. It was the good time for Patricians."

A change of political parties was imminent; Whig rule had lasted seventy years, and England had become tolerably disgusted with the consequences.

"Now that George II was dead," says Macaulay, "a courtier might venture to ask why England was to become a party in a dispute between two German powers. What was it to her whether the House of Hapsburg or the House of Brandenburg ruled in Silesia? Why were the best English regiments fighting on the Maine? Why were the Prussian battalions paid with English gold? The great minister seemed to think it beneath him to calculate the price of victory. As long as the Tower guns were fired, as the streets were illuminated, as French banners were carried in triumph through London, it was to him matter of indifference to what extent the public burdens were augmented. Nay, he seemed to glory in the magnitude of those sacrifices which the people, fascinated by his eloquence and success, had too readily made, and would long and bitterly regret. There was no check on waste or embezzlement. Our commissaries returned from the camp of Prince Ferdinand, to buy boroughs, to rear palaces, to rival the magnificence of the old aristocracy of the realm. Already had we borrowed, in four years of war, more than the most skilful and economical government would pay in forty years of peace."

The Church allied itself with the Tories, who assumed the reins of government, and thenceforth totally forgot the views of liberty they had maintained when in opposition. The policy of all their succeeding legislation was that of mischievous retrogression: they sought to excel the old Whigs in their efforts to consolidate the aristocracy at the expense of the people.

"This reactionary movement," Buckle declares, was greatly aided by the personal character of George III; for he, being despotic as well as superstitious, was equally anxious to extend the prerogative, and strengthen the Church. Every Liberal sentiment, everything approaching to reform—nay, even the mere mention of inquiry, was an abomination in the eyes of

that narrow and ignorant Prince. Without knowledge, without taste, without even a glimpse of one of the sciences, or a feeling for one of the fine arts, education had done nothing to enlarge a mind which nature had more than usually contracted. Totally ignorant of the history and resources of foreign countries, and barely knowing their geographical position, his information was scarcely more extensive respecting the people over whom he was called to rule. In that immense mass of evidence now extant, and which consists of every description of private correspondence, records of private conversation, and of public acts, there is not to be found the slightest proof that he knew any one of those numerous things which the governor of a country ought to know; or, indeed, that he was acquainted with a single duty of his position, except the mere mechanical routine of ordinary business, which might have been effected by the lowest clerk in the meanest office in his kingdom.

“He gathered round his throne that great party, who, clinging to the tradition of the past, have always made it their boast to check the progress of their age. During the sixty years of his reign he, with the sole exception of Pitt, never willingly admitted to his councils a single man of great ability; not one whose name is associated with any measure of value, either in domestic or foreign policy. Even Pitt only maintained his position in the State by forgetting the lessons of his illustrious father, and abandoning those liberal principles in which he had been educated, and with which he entered public life. Because George III hated the idea of reform, Pitt not only relinquished what he had before declared to be absolutely necessary, but did not hesitate to persecute to death the party with whom he had once associated in order to obtain it. Because George III looked upon slavery as one of those good old customs which the wisdom of his ancestors had consecrated, Pitt did not dare to use his power for procuring its abolition, but left to his successors the glory of destroying that infamous trade, on the preservation of which his Royal master had set his heart. Because George III detested the French—of whom he knew as much as he knew of the inhabitants of Kamschatka or Thibet—Pitt, contrary to his own judgment, engaged in a war

with France, by which England was seriously imperilled, and the English people burdened with a debt that their remotest posterity will be unable to pay. But, notwithstanding all this, when Pitt, only a few years before his death, showed a determination to concede to the Irish a small share of their undoubted rights, the King dismissed him from office, and the King's friends, as they were called, expressed their indignation at the presumption of a minister who could oppose the wishes of so benign and gracious a master. And when, unhappily for his own fame, this great man determined to return to power, he could only recover office by conceding that very point for which he had relinquished it; thus settling the mischievous example of the minister of a free country sacrificing his own judgment to the personal prejudices of the reigning sovereign. As it was hardly possible to find other ministers who to equal abilities would add equal subservience, it is not surprising that the highest offices were constantly filled with men of notorious incapacity. Indeed, the King seemed to have an instinctive antipathy to everything great and noble. During the reign of George II the elder Pitt had won for himself a reputation which covered the world, and had carried to an unprecedented height the glories of the English name. He, however, as the avowed friend of popular rights, strenuously opposed the despotic principles of the Court; and for this reason he was hated by George III with a hatred that seemed barely compatible with a sane mind. Fox was one of the greatest statesmen of the eighteenth century, and was better acquainted than any other with the character and resources of those foreign nations with which our interests were intimately connected. To this rare and important knowledge he added a sweetness and amenity of temper which extorted the praises of even his political opponents. But he, too, was the steady supporter of civil and religious liberty; and he, too, was so detested by George III that the King, with his own hand, struck his name out of the list of Privy Councillors, and declared that he would rather abdicate the throne than admit him to a share in the Government.

“While this unfavorable change was taking place in the

sovereign and ministers of the country, a change equally unfavorable was being effected in the second branch of the Imperial Legislature. Until the reign of George III the House of Lords was decidedly superior to the House of Commons in the liberality and general accomplishments of its members. It is true that in both houses there prevailed a spirit which must be called narrow and superstitious if tried by the larger standard of the present age. . . .

“The superiority of the Upper House over the Lower was on the whole steadily maintained during the reign of George II, the ministers not being anxious to strengthen the High Church party in the Lords, and the King himself so rarely suggesting fresh creations as to cause a belief that he particularly disliked increasing their numbers. It was reserved for George III by an unsparing use of his prerogative, entirely to change the character of the Upper House, and thus lay the foundation for that disrepute into which, since then, the peers have been constantly falling. The creations he made were numerous beyond all precedent, their object evidently being to neutralise the liberal spirit hitherto prevailing, and thus turn the House of Lords into an engine for resisting the popular wishes, and stopping the progress of reform. How completely this plan succeeded is well-known to the readers of our history: indeed, it was sure to be successful considering the character of the men who were promoted. They consisted almost entirely of two classes—of country gentlemen, remarkable for nothing but their wealth, and the number of votes their wealth enabled them to control; and of mere lawyers, who had risen to judicial appointments partly from their professional learning, but chiefly from the zeal with which they repressed the popular liberties, and favored the Royal prerogative.

“That this is no exaggerated description may be ascertained by anyone who will consult the lists of the new peers made by George III. Here and there we find an eminent man, whose public services were so notorious that it was impossible to avoid rewarding them; but, putting aside those who were in a manner forced upon the Sovereign, it would be idle to

deny that the remainder, and, of course, the overwhelming majority, were marked by a narrowness and illiberality of sentiment, which, more than anything else, brought the whole order into contempt. No great thinkers, no great writers, no great orators, no great statesmen, none of the true nobility of the land, were to be found among the spurious nobles created by George III."

In the early part of his reign, George III (whom even the courtly Alison pictures as having "little education, and no great acquired information") was very much under the influence of his mother, who had, previously to his being King, often spoken of her son with contempt. The Princess of Wales, in turn, was almost entirely guided by Lord Bute, represented by scandal, says Macaulay, as "her favored lover". "Of this attachment," Dr. Doran tells us, "the Prince of Wales himself is said to have had full knowledge, and did not object to Lord Bute taking solitary walks with the Princess, while *he* could do the same with Lady Middlesex." The most infamous stories were circulated in the *Whisperer*, and other journals of the time, as to the nature of the association between the Scotch Peer and the King's mother, and its results. Phillimore regarded the Princess of Wales as "before and after her husband's death the mistress of Lord Bute". The Princess Dowager seems to have been a hard woman. Walpole tells us how, when the Princess Dowager reproved one of her maids of honor for irregular habits, the latter replied: "*Madame, chacun a son But.*" "Seeing," says Thackeray, "the young Duke of Gloucester silent and unhappy once, she sharply asked him the cause of his silence. 'I am thinking,' said the poor child. 'Thinking, Sir! and of what?' 'I am thinking, if ever I have a son, I will not make him so unhappy as you make me.'"

John Stuart, Earl of Bute, shared with William Pitt and John Wilkes the bulk of popular attention during the first ten years of the King's reign. Bute had risen rapidly to favor, having attracted the attention of the Princess Dowager at some private theatricals, and he became by her influence Groom of the Stole. His poverty and ambition made him grasp at power, both against the great Commoner and the Pelham

faction; and a lady observer described the great question of the day in 1760, as being whether the King would burn in his chamber *Scotch* coal, *Newcastle* coal, or *Pitt* coal. Macaulay, who seems to have followed Lord Waldegrave's "Memoirs", says of Bute: "A handsome leg was among his chief qualifications for the stage. . . . His understanding was narrow, his manners cold and haughty." His qualifications for the part of a statesman were best described by Prince Frederick, who often indulged in the unprincely luxury of sneering at his dependents. "Bute," said his Royal Highness, "you are the very man to be envoy at some small, proud German Court, where there is nothing to do." Phillimore speaks of Lord Bute as a "minion raised by Court favor to a post where his ignorance, mean understanding, and his disregard of English honor, became national calamities".

The King's speech on his accession is said to have been drawn up by Bute, who did not then belong to the Council; but the terms being vehemently objected to by Pitt, it was actually altered after it had been spoken, and before it found its way to the printer.

Whatever were the relations between Lord Bute and the Princess Dowager, it is quite certain that on more than one occasion George III condescended not only to prevaricate, but to lie downright as to the influence exercised by Lord Bute. It is certain, from the "Memoirs" of Earl Waldegrave and other trustworthy sources, that the Scotch Earl, after being hissed out of office by the people, was still secretly consulted by the King, who, like the true Royal Brunswick, did not hesitate to use falsehoods on the subject, even to his own ministers. Phillimore, in remarkably strong language, describes George III as an "ignorant, dishonest, obstinate, narrow-minded boy, at that very moment the tool of an adulteress and her paramour." The Duke of Bedford has not only put upon record, in his correspondence, his conviction that the King behaved unfaithfully to his ministers, but asserts that he told him so to his face.

In 1759, George was married to Hannah Lightfoot, a Quakeress, in Curzon Street Chapel, Mayfair, in the presence

of his brother, Edward Duke of York. Great doubt has, however, been cast on the fact as well as the legality of the marriage. It would, if in all respects valid, have rendered null, as a bigamous contract, the subsequent marriage entered into by the King. Dr. Doran alleges that the Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV, when needing money in later years, used this Lightfoot marriage as a threat against his Royal parents—that is, that he threatened to expose his mother's shame and his own illegitimacy if the Queen would not use her influence with Pitt. Glorious family, these Brunswicks ! Walpole affirms that, early in his reign, George III admitted to his uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, “that it had not been common in their family to live well together”.

On the 18th September, 1761, George was married to the Princess Charlotte Sophia, of Mecklenburgh Strelitz, Hannah Lightfoot being still living. Of the new Queen, Phillimore says : “If to watch over the education of her children and to promote their happiness be any part of a woman's duty, she has little claim to the praises that have been so lavishly bestowed on her as a model of domestic virtue. Her religion was displayed in the scrupulous observance of external forms. Repulsive in her aspect, grovelling in her instincts, sordid in her habits ; steeped, from the cradle, in the stupid pride which was the atmosphere of her stolid and most insignificant race ; inexorably severe to those who yielded to temptation from which she was protected, not more by her situation and the vigilance of those around her, than by the extreme homeliness of her person ; bigoted, avaricious, unamiable to brutality, she added dulness and gloom even to the English court.”

In 1761, the Duke of Bedford was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, that unfortunate country, for centuries governed by men who tried to exterminate its native population, and used under the first three reigns of the House of Brunswick as a sponge out of which, regardless of much bloodshed and more misery, gold could be squeezed for the dependents and relatives of aristocrats in office. His reign of office in Ireland was brief. Walpole says that “the ill-humor of the country determined the Duke of Bedford to quit the Government, after having amply gratified

his family and dependents with pensions". It was this Duke of Bedford who consented that the Princess of Hesse should have a pension of £6,000 a year out of the Irish revenue, and who gave to his own relative, the Lady Betty Waldegrave, £800 a-year from the same source. Shortly after this, Prince Charles of Strelitz, the Queen's brother, received £30,000 towards the payment of the debts he owed in Germany. This £30,000 was nominally given by the King out of the Civil List, but was really paid by the nation when discharging the Civil List debts which it increased. On the motion of Lord Barrington, £400,000 subsidy was granted this year to the Landgrave of Hesse, under a secret treaty made by George II, without the knowledge or consent of Parliament, and £300,000 was also voted to the Chancery of Hanover for forage for Hanoverian, Prussian, and Hessian Cavalry.

On August 12th, 1762, George Prince of Wales was born; and in the same year, with the direct connivance of George III, the Peace of Paris was made: a peace as disgraceful to England, under the circumstances, as can be possibly imagined. Lord Bute, who was roundly charged with receiving money from France for his services, and this with the knowledge of the mother of George III, most certainly communicated to the French minister "the most secret councils of the English cabinet". This was done with the distinct concurrence of George III, who was himself bribed by the immediate evacuation of his Hanoverian dominions. In the debate in the Lords on the preliminaries of Peace, Horace Walpole tells us that "the Duke of Grafton, with great weight and greater warmth, attacked them severely, and, looking full on Lord Bute, imputed to him corruption and worse arts". Count Virri, the disreputable agent employed in this matter by the King and Lord Bute, was rewarded under the false name of George Charles with a pension of £1,000 a year out of the Irish revenues. Phillimore may well declare that Lord Bute was "a minion, raised by Court favor to a post where his ignorance, mean understanding, and disregard of English honor, became national calamities". To carry the approval of this Peace of Paris through the Commons, Fox, afterwards Lord Holland, was purchased with a

most lucrative appointment, although only shortly before he had published a print of George, with the following lines, referring to the Princess Dowager and Lord Bute, written under the likeness :—

" Son of a ———
I could say more."

To gain a majority in the House of Commons, Walpole tells us "that a shop was publicly opened at the pay office, whither the members flocked and received the wages of their venality in bank bills, even to so low a sum as £200, for their votes on the treaty. £25,000 was thus issued in one morning." Lord Chesterfield speaks of the large sums disbursed by the King "for the hire of Parliament men".

As an illustration of the unblushing corruption of the age, the following letter from Lord Saye and Sele to Mr. Grenville, then Prime Minister of England, tells its own tale :

" November 26th, 1763.

" HONORED SIR,—I am very much obliged to you for that freedom of converse you this morning indulged me in, which I prize more than the lucrative advantage I then received. To show the sincerity of my words (pardon, Sir, the over-niceness of my disposition), I return enclosed the bill for £300 you favored me with, as good manners would not permit my refusal of it when tendered by you.

" Your much obliged and obedient servant,

" SAYE AND SELE.

" As a free horse needs no spur, so I stand in need of no inducement or douceur to lend my small assistance to the King or his friends in the present Administration."

That such bribery was part of the general practice of the Government under George III may be seen by the following extract from an infamous letter written about fifteen years later by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland: "No man can see the inconvenience of increasing the Peers more forcibly than myself: but the recommendation of many of those persons submitted to his Majesty for that honor arose from engagements

taken up at the press of the moment to rescue questions upon which the English Government were very particularly anxious. My sentiments cannot be but the same with reference to the Privy Council and pensions, and I had not contracted any absolute engagements of recommendations, either to peerage or pension, till difficulties arose which necessarily occasioned so much anxiety in his Majesty's Cabinet, that I must have been culpable in neglecting any possible means to secure a majority in the House of Commons."

A good story is told of the Great Commoner Pitt's repartee to Fox (afterwards Lord Holland), in one of the debates of this period. "Pitt," says the *London Chronicle*, "in the heat of his declamation, proceeded so far as to attack the personal deformity of Fox; and represented his gloomy and lowering countenance, with the penthouse of his eyebrows, as Churchill phrases it, as a true introduction of his dark and double mind. Mr. Fox was nettled at this personal reflection, and the more so, perhaps, that it was as just as it was cutting. He therefore got up, and, after inveighing bitterly against the indecency of his antagonist in descending to remark on his bodily defects, observed that his figure was such as God Almighty had made it, and he could not do look otherwise; and then in a tone between the plaintive and indignant, cried out, 'How, gentlemen, shall I *look*?' Most of the members, apprehending that Mr. Pitt had gone rather too far, were inclined to think that Mr. Fox had got the better of him. But Mr. Pitt started up, and with one of those happy turns in which he so much excels, silenced his rival, and made him sit down with a countenance, if possible, more abashed than formerly. '*Look!* Sir', said he—'*look* as you *cannot* look, if you *would*—*look* as you *dare* not look, if you *could*—*look* like an *honest man!*'"

In the *London Chronicle* for March, 1763, we find bitter complaints that since 1766 "every obsolete, useless place has been revived, and every occasion of increasing salaries seized with eagerness," and that a great Whig leader "has just condescended to stipulate for an additional salary, without power, as the price of his support to the Tory Government".

In March, 1763, George III gave four ships of war to the

King of Sardinia at the national expense, and in August a fifth vessel appears to have been given.

On the 23rd of April, 1763, No. 44 of the *North Briton*, a journal which had been started in opposition to Lord Bute's paper, the *Briton*, was published, severely criticising the King's speech, and warmly attacking Lord Bute. This issue provoked the ministers to a course of the utmost illegality. A *general warrant* to seize all persons concerned in the publication of the *North Briton*, without specifying their names, was immediately issued by the Secretary of State, and a number of printers and publishers were placed in custody, some of whom were not at all concerned in the obnoxious publication. Late on the night of the 29th of April the messengers entered the house of John Wilkes, M.P., for Aylesbury (the author of the article in question), and produced their warrant, with which he refused to comply. On the following morning, however, he was carried before the Secretary of State, and committed a close prisoner to the Tower, his papers being previously seized and sealed, and all access to his person strictly prohibited. The warrant was clearly an illegal one, and had only been previously resorted to in one or two instances, and under very extraordinary circumstances, of which there were none in the present case. Wilkes's friends immediately obtained a writ of *habeas corpus*, which the ministers defeated by a mean subterfuge; and it was found necessary to obtain a second before they could bring the prisoner before the Court of King's Bench, by which he was set at liberty, on the ground of his privilege as a Member of Parliament. He then opened an angry correspondence, followed by actions at law, against the Secretaries of State, for the seizure of his papers, and for the wrongful arrest. These actions abated, although in the one for the seizure of the papers a verdict was given for £1,000 damages and costs. But in the meantime the Attorney-General had been directed to institute a prosecution against Wilkes, in the King's Bench, for blasphemous and obscene libel, and the King had ordered him to be deprived of his commission as Colonel in the Buckinghamshire Militia. The King further exhibited his resentment by depriving Lord Temple of the Lord Lieutenancy of the same county, and

striking his name out of the Council-book, for an expression of personal sympathy which had fallen from him. Worse than all, this King George III actually deprived General A'Court, M.P. for Heytesbury, of his commission as Colonel of the 11th Dragoons for having voted that the arrest of Wilkes was a breach of privilege. He also caused it to be intimated to General Conway, "that the King cannot trust his army in the hands of a man who votes in Parliament against him".

The House of Commons ordered the *North Briton* to be burned by the common hangman; but when the authorities attempted to carry out the sentence, the people assembled, rescued the number, and burned instead a large jack-boot, the popular hieroglyphic for the unpopular minister.

As an illustration of the then disgraceful state of the English law, it is enough to notice that Lord Halifax, the Secretary of State, by availing himself of his privileges as a peer, managed to delay John Wilkes in his action from June, 1763, to November, 1764; and then, Wilkes having been outlawed, the noble Earl appeared and pleaded the outlawry as a bar to further proceedings. Ultimately, after five years' delay, Wilkes annulled the outlawry, and recovered £4,000 damages against Lord Halifax. For a few months Wilkes was a popular idol, and had he been a man of real earnestness and integrity, might have taken a permanent leading position in the State.

In August, 1763, Frederick, Duke of York, was born. He was created Prince Bishop of Osnaburg before he could speak. The King and Queen were much dissatisfied because the clergy of the diocese, who did not dispute the baby bishop's ability to attend to the souls of his flock, yet refused to entrust to him the irresponsible guardianship of the episcopal funds. This bishopric had actually been kept vacant by the King nearly three years, in order that he might not give it to the Duke of Cumberland. The income was about £25,000 a year, and it was to secure this Prince Bishopric for the Duke of Cumberland that George II burthened the country with several subsidies to petty European sovereigns.

The King's sister, Augusta, was, like the rest of the Brunswick family, on extremely bad terms with her mother, the

Princess of Wales. The Princess Augusta was married on January 16th, 1764, to the hereditary Prince of Brunswick, who received £80,000, besides £8,000 a year, for becoming the husband of one of our Royal family. In addition to this George III and Queen Charlotte insulted the newly married couple, who returned the insult with interest. Pleasant people, these Brunswicks.

In March, 1764, the first steps were taken in the endeavor to impose taxes on the American colonies, an endeavor which at length resulted in their famous rebellion. The commanders of our ships of war on the American coast were sworn in to act as revenue officers, the consequence of which was the frequently illegal seizure of ships and cargoes without any means of redress for the Americans in their own colony. As though to add to the rising disaffection, Mr. Grenville proposed a new stamp-tax. As soon as the Stamp Act reached Boston, the ships in the harbor hung their colors half-mast high, the bells were rung muffled, the Act of Parliament was reprinted with a death's head for title, and sold in the streets as the "Folly of England and Ruin of America". The Americans refused to use stamped paper. The Government distributors of stamps were either forced to return to England, or were obliged to renounce publicly and upon oath their official employment; and when the matter was again brought before the English House of Commons Pitt denied the right of Parliament to levy taxation on persons who had no right to representation, and exclaimed: "I rejoice that America has resisted: three millions of people so dead to all feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest". The supporters of the Government actually advanced the ridiculously absurd and most monstrous pretention that America was in law represented in Parliament as part of the manor of East Greenwich! In consequence of the firm resistance of the American colonies the Stamp Act was repealed on the 18th March, 1766.

The Earl of Abercorn and Lord Harcourt appeared to have been consulted by the Queen as to the effect of the previous marriage of George III with Hannah Lightfoot, who seems to

have been got rid of by some arrangement for a second marriage between her and a Mr. Axford, to whom a sum of money was paid. It is alleged that this was done without the knowledge of the King, who entreated Lord Chatham to discover whither the Quakeress had gone. No fresh communication, however, took place between George III and Hannah Lightfoot; and the King's first attack of insanity, which took place in 1764, is strongly suggested to have followed the more than doubts as to the legality of the second marriage and the legitimacy of the Royal Family. Hannah Lightfoot died in the winter of 1764; and in the early part of the year 1765, the King being then scarcely sane, a second ceremony of marriage with the Queen, was privately performed by the Rev. Dr. Wilmot, at Kew Palace. Hannah Lightfoot left children by George III, but of these nothing is known.

In the winter of 1764, and spring of 1765, George III was, in diplomatic language, laboring under an indisposition; in truth, he was mad. A Bill was introduced in 1764 in the House of Lords, to provide for a Regency in case of the recurrence of any similar attack. In the discussion on this Bill, a doubt arose as to who were to be regarded as the Royal Family; fortunately, the Law Lords limited it to the descendants of George II. If a similar definition prevailed to-day, we should perhaps not be obliged to pay the pensions to the Duke of Cambridge and Princess Mary, which they at present receive as members of the Royal Family. The King, enraged that his mother's name was omitted from the Regency Bill, hurriedly dismissed the Grenville-Bedford Ministry.

On the 30th of October, 1765, William, Duke of Cumberland, the King's uncle, died. Dr. Doran says of him: "As he grew in manhood his heart became hardened; he had no affection for his family, nor fondness for the army, for which he affected attachment. When his brother (Prince Frederick) died, pleasure not pain made his heart throb, as he sarcastically exclaimed: 'It's a great blow to the country, but I hope it will recover in time'. He was the author of what was called 'the bloody Mutiny Act'. 'He was dissolute and a gambler.' After the 'disgraceful surrender of Hanover, and the infamous con-

vention of Klosterseven', his father, George II, said, 'Behold the son who has ruined me and disgraced himself.' His own nephew, George III, believed the Duke to be capable of murder." The Dukes of Cumberland in this Brunswick family have had a most unfortunate reputation.

In 1766, William Henry, Duke of Gloucester, brother of the King, married Maria, Countess Dowager of Waldegrave. This marriage was at the time repudiated by the rest of the Royal Family.

In October of the same year, Caroline Matilda, the King's sister, married Christian, King of Denmark, an unfeeling, dissolute brute. Our Princess, who lived very unhappily, was afterwards accused of adultery, and rescued from punishment by a British man-of-war.

In the autumn of 1766, in consequence of the high price of provisions, and taxes, large gatherings took place in many parts of the Kingdom; these assemblages were dispersed with considerable loss of life, of course by the military, which the House of Brunswick was not slow to use in checking political manifestations. At Derby, the people were charged by the cavalry; at Colton, eight were shot dead; in Gloucestershire many lives were lost; in fact, from Exeter to Berwick-on-Tweed, there was one ferment of discontent and dissatisfaction. The people were heavily taxed, the aristocracy corrupt and careless. As an instance of the madness of the governing classes, it is sufficient to point out that in 1767, while taxation was increasing, the landed gentry who were rapidly appropriating common lands under Private Enclosure Acts, most audaciously reduced the land tax by one-fourth. During the first thirty-seven years of the reign of George III, there were no less than 1,532 Enclosure Acts passed, affecting in all 2,804,197 acres of land, filched from the nation by a few families. Wealth took and poverty lost; riches got land without burden, and labor inherited burden in lieu of land. In the early part of the reign of George III, land, yielding about a sixth or seventh of its present rental, paid the same nominal tax that it does to-day, the actual amount paid at the present time being, however, smaller, through redemp-

tion; and yet then the annual interest on the National Debt was under £4,500,000, while to-day a sum of £28,000,000 is required for the interest and management of the debt. Then the King's Civil List covered all the expenses of our State ministers and diplomatic representatives; to-day an enormous additional sum is required, and a Prime Minister, professing economy and well versed in history, has actually the audacity to pretend that the country gains by its present Civil List arrangement. In 1767 a variety of duties were enacted for collection in the American colonies, and, to prepare for a possible struggle, two regiments were sent from England to Massachusetts to protect the Commissioners of Customs.

In 1769, George III announced to his faithful Commons, that he owed half a million. John Wilkes and a few others protested, but the money, £513,511, was voted.

In 1770, King George III succeeded in making several buttons at Kew. His son, afterwards George IV, made a shoe-buckle. No other useful product has resulted directly from the efforts of any male of the family. As a set-off to the buttons, George III, this year, brought the Tories into power under Lord North.

In 1770, Henry, Duke of Cumberland, the King's brother, was sued by Lord Grosvenor for *crim. con.*, and had to pay £10,000 damages. This same Henry, in the following year, went through the form of marriage with a Mrs. Horton, which marriage, being repudiated by the Court, troubled him but little, and in the lifetime of the lady he contracted a second alliance, which gave rise to the famous Olivia Serres legitimacy issue.

The Royal Marriage Act, a most infamous measure for insuring the perpetuation of royal vice, and said to be the result of the Lightfoot experience, was introduced to Parliament by a message from George III, on the 20th February, 1772, twelve days after the death of the Princess-Dowager of Wales. George III wrote to Lord North on the 26th February: "I expect every nerve to be strained to carry the Bill. It is not a question relating to the Administration, but personally to myself, therefore I have a right to expect a hearty

support from everyone in my service, and I shall remember defaulters."

In May, 1773, the East Indian Company applying to Parliament for borrowing powers, a select committee was appointed, whose inquiries laid open cases of rapacity and treachery involving the highest personages, and a resolution was carried in the House of Commons, affirming that Lord Clive had dishonorably possessed himself of £234,000 at the time of the deposition of Suraja Dowlah, and the establishment of Meer Jaffier. Besides this, it was proved that Lord Clive received several other large sums in succeeding years. Phillimore describes this transaction as one of "disgusting and sordid turpitude", declaring that "individual members of the English Government were to be paid for their treachery by a hire, the amount of which is almost incredible". A few years after this exposure, Lord Clive committed suicide.

The weavers being in great distress, meetings were announced. On April 26th, 1773, George III wrote to Lord North: "The passing any Bill with a tendency to alleviate the weavers, if they previously assemble, would be quite contrary to my ideas of propriety, for it would be an encouragement to every other body of men riotously to combine as a sure means of obtaining what wild minds may dictate".

On the 18th of December, 1773, the celebrated cargoes of tea were thrown overboard in Boston Harbor. The tea duty was a trifling one, but was insisted upon by the King's Government as an assertion of the right of the British Parliament to tax the unrepresented American colonies, a right the colonists strenuously and successfully denied. Lord North said "a total repeal cannot be thought of until America is prostrate at our feet".

The news of the firm attitude of the Bay State colonists arrived in England early in May, 1774, and Lord North's Government, urged by the King, deprived Boston of her privileges as a port; took away from the State of Massachusetts the whole of the executive powers granted by the charter of William III, vested the nomination of magistrates of every kind in the King or royally-appointed Governor, and

carried an enactment authorising persons accused of political offences committed in Boston to be sent home to England to be tried.

These monstrous statutes provoked the most decided resistance ; all the other American colonies joined with Massachusetts, and a solemn league and covenant was entered into for suspending all commercial intercourse with Great Britain until the obnoxious Acts were repealed. On the 5th of September, 1774, a congress of fifty-one representatives, from twelve old colonies, assembled in Philadelphia. The instructions given to them disclaimed every idea of independence, recognised the constitutional authority of the mother country, and acknowledged the prerogatives of the crown ; but unanimously declared that they would never give up the rights and liberties derived to them from their ancestors as British subjects, and pronounced the late Acts relative to the colony of Massachusetts Bay to be unconstitutional, oppressive, and dangerous. The first public act of the congress was a resolution declarative of their favorable disposition towards the colony above-mentioned ; and, by subsequent resolutions, they formally approved the opposition it had given to the obnoxious Acts, and declared that, if an attempt were made to carry them into execution by force, the colony should be supported by all America.

The following extract is from the "Address of the Twelve United Provinces to the Inhabitants of Great Britain", when force was actually used : "We can retire beyond the reach of your navy, and, without any sensible diminution of the necessities of life, enjoy a luxury, which from that period you will want—the luxury of being free".

The Duke of Gloucester, who had married without the King's consent, and with whom George III was therefore on bad terms, having expressed his intention of applying to Parliament for some allowance, the King wrote : "all the answer to be given by my ministers is that it is natural the King should not apply to Parliament for provisions for the children of a younger branch of his family, when he has not yet done it for his own numerous offspring". The Duke of Gloucester, going abroad, was asked by Lord Rochford whither

he was going, when he replied, "To Rome, my lord, the only place where I and the Pretender can live."

On the 16th of November, 1775, Edmund Burke proposed the renunciation on the part of Great Britain of the exercise of taxation in America, the repeal of the obnoxious duty on tea, and a general pardon for past political offenders. This was directly opposed by the King—who had lists brought to him showing how the members spoke and voted—and was negatived in the House of Commons by 210 votes against 105. On the 20th of November, after consultation with George III, Lord North introduced a Bill by which all trade and commerce with the thirteen United Colonies were interdicted. It authorised the seizure, whether in harbor or on the high seas, of all vessels laden with American property, and by a cruel stretch of refined tyranny, it rendered all persons taken on board American vessels liable to be entered as sailors on board British ships of war, and to serve (if required) against their own countrymen. About the same time, as we learn by a "secret" despatch from Lord Dartmouth to General Howe, the King had been unmanly enough to apply to the Czarina of Russia for the loan of 20,000 Russian soldiers to enable him to crush his English subjects in the American colonies. As yet the Americans had made no claim for independence. They were only petitioners for justice.

In order to crush out the spirit of liberty in the American colonies, the Government of George III, in February, 1776, hired 17,000 men from the Landgrave and Hereditary Prince of Hesse Cassel, and from the Duke of Brunswick. Besides these, there were levies of troops out of George III's Hanoverian dominions; and that nothing might be wanting to our glory, the King's agents stirred up the Cherokee and Creek Indians to scalp, ravish, and plunder the disaffected colonists. Jesse says: "The newly-arrived troops comprised several thousand kidnapped German soldiers, whom the cupidity of the Duke of Brunswick, of the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, and other German Princes, had induced to let out for hire to the British Government. . . . Frederick of Prussia not only denounced the traffic as a most scandalous one, but whenever, it is said, the unfortunate hirelings had occasion to march through any

part of his dominions, used to levy a toll upon them, as if they had been so many head of bullocks. . . . They had been sold, he said, as cattle, and therefore he was entitled to exact the toll."

The consequence of all this was, on the 4th July, 1776, the famous declaration of the American Congress. "The History of the reigning sovereign," they said, "was a history of repeated injuries and usurpations. So evidently was it his intention to establish an absolute despotism, that it had become their duty, as well as their right, to secure themselves against further aggressions. . . . In every stage of these oppressions," proceeds the Declaration, "we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms. Our petitions have been answered only by repeated injuries. A prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people." And the United Colonies solemnly declared themselves to be free and independent States.

In 1777, during this American war, Earl Chatham, in one of his grand speeches, after denouncing "the traffic and barter driven with every little pitiful German Prince that sells his subjects to the shambles of a foreign country", adds: "The mercenary aid on which you rely irritates to an incurable resentment the minds of your enemies, whom you overrun with the sordid sons of rapine and of plunder, devoting them and their possessions to the rapacity of hireling cruelty! If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms, never! never! never!" In reply to Lord Suffolk, who had said, in reference to employing the Indians, that "we were justified in using all the means which God and nature had put into our hands", "I am astonished," exclaimed Lord Chatham, as he rose, "shocked to hear such principles confessed, to hear them avowed in this House, or in this country; principles equally unconstitutional, inhuman, and un-Christian. *That God and nature put into our hands!* I know not what idea the lord may entertain of God and nature, but I know that such abominable principles are equally abhorrent to religion and humanity. What! attribute the sacred sanction of God and nature to the massacres of the Indian scalping-knife, to the cannibal savage,

torturing, murdering, roasting and eating—literally, my lords, eating—the mangled victims of his barbarous battles!”

And yet even after this we find George III writing to Lord North, on the 22nd of June, 1779: “I do not yet despair that, with Clinton’s activity, and the Indians in their rear, the provinces will soon now submit.

Actually so late as the 27th of November, 1781, after the surrender of Cornwallis, we find George III saying that, “retaining a firm confidence in the wisdom and protection of Divine Providence,” he should be able “by the valor of his fleets and armies to conquer America”. Fox, in the House of Commons, denounced this speech of the King’s as one “breathing vengeance, blood, and misery, and rancor”; and “as containing the sentiments of some arbitrary, despotic, hard-hearted, and unfeeling monarch, who, having involved his subjects in a ruinous and unnatural war to glut his feelings of revenge, was determined to persevere in it in spite of calamity”. “Divest the speech,” said he, “of its official forms, and what was its purport? Our losses in America have been most calamitous; the blood of my subjects has flowed in copious streams; the treasuries of Great Britain have been wantonly lavished; the load of taxes imposed on an overburthened country is become intolerable; my rage for conquest is unquenched; my revenge unsated; nor can anything, except the total subjugation of my American subjects, allay my animosity.”

The naval and military expenditure for the years during which this disastrous war continued amounted to £139,521,035.

In addition to this must be noted £1,340,000 voted as compensation to American loyalists in 1788, and £4,000 a year pension to this day paid to the descendants of William Penn, amounting, with compound interest, to an enormous additional sum, without reckoning future liability. Also a continent parted from us in blood and shame, in consequence of a vain attempt to gratify the desire of the House of Brunswick to make New England contribute to German greed as freely and as servilely as had Old England.

Encouraged by the willingness with which his former debts had been discharged, George III, in 1777, sent a second message


to his faithful Commons, but this time for the larger sum of £618,340, which was not only paid, but an additional allowance of £100,000 a year was voted to his Majesty, and £40,000 was given to the Landgrave of Hesse.

The then barbarity of our laws is shown by the fact that, in 1777, Sarah Parker was burnt for counterfeiting silver coin; in June, 1786, Phœbe Harris was burnt for the same offence, and this in a reign when persons in high position accused of murder, forgery, perjury, and robbery, escaped almost scot free.

In April, 1778, £60,000 a year was settled on the six younger princes, and £30,000 a year on the five princesses. These pensions, however, were professedly paid out of the King's Civil List, not avowedly in addition to it, as they are to-day. The Duke of Buckingham stated that in 1778, and again in 1782, the King threatened to abdicate. This threat, which unfortunately was never carried out, arose from the King's obstinate persistence in the worse than insane policy against the American colonies.

In December, 1779, in consequence of England needing Irish soldiers to make war on America, Ireland was graciously permitted to export Irish woollen manufactures. The indulgences, however, to Ireland—even while the ministers of George III were trying to enlist Irishmen to kill the English, Scotch, and Irish in America—were made most grudgingly. Pious Protestant George III would not consent that any Irish Catholic should own one foot of freehold land; and Edmund Burke, in a letter to an Irish peer, says that it was pride, arrogance, and a spirit of domination, which kept up “these unjust legal disabilities”.

On the 8th February, 1780, Sir G. Savile presented the famous Yorkshire petition, signed by 8,000 freeholders, praying the House of Commons to inquire into the management and expenditure of public money, to reduce all exorbitant emoluments, and to abolish all sinecure places and unmerited pensions. Three days later, Edmund Burke proposed a reduction of the national taxation (which was then only a sixth part of its amount to-day), and a diminution of the power of the Crown. Burke was defeated, but shortly after, on the motion of Mr.



Dunning, the House of Commons declared by a majority of 18 against the Government, "That the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished".

On the 20th March, 1782, Lord North, in consequence of the impossibility of subduing the American colonies, determined to resign. The King opposed this to the last, declaring that no difficulties should induce him to consent to a peace acknowledging the Independence of America. "So distressing," says Jesse, "was the conflict which prevailed in the mind of George III, that he not only contemplated abandoning the Crown of England for the Electorate of Hanover, but orders had actually been issued to have the royal yacht in readiness for his flight." What a blessing to the country if he had really persevered in his resolution!

Charles James Fox, who now came into power for a brief space, had, says Jesse, "taught himself to look upon his sovereign as a mere dull, obstinate, half-crazed, and narrow-minded bigot; a Prince whose shallow understanding had never been improved by education, whose prejudices it was impossible to remove, and whose resentments it would be idle to endeavor to soften."

In July, 1782, Lord Shelburne came into office; but he "always complained that the King had tricked and deserted him", and had "secretly connived at his downfall". He resigned office on the 24th February, 1783. An attempt was made to form a Coalition Ministry under the Duke of Portland. The king complained of being treated with personal incivility, and the attempt failed. On the 23rd March the Prince of Wales, at the Queen's Drawing-room, said: "The King had refused to accept the coalition, but, by God, he should be made to agree to it." Under the great excitement, the King's health gave way. The Prince, says Jesse, was a member of Brook's Club, where, as Walpole tells us, the members were not only "strangely licentious", but in their zeal for the interests of the heartless young Prince, "even wagered on the duration of the King's reign." The King repeated his threat of abandoning the throne, and retiring to the Hanoverian dominions; and told the Lord Advocate, Dundas, that he had obtained the consent of

the Queen to his taking this extraordinary step. Young William Pitt refusing twice to accept the Premiership, Fox and Lord North came again into power. £30,000 was voted for the Prince of Wales' debts, and a similar sum to enable him to furnish his house. The "unnatural" Coalition Ministry did not last long. Fox introduced his famous India Bill. The King regarding it as a blow at the power of the Crown, caballed and canvassed the Peers against it. "The welfare of thirty millions of people was overlooked in the excitement produced by selfish interests, by party zeal, and officious loyalty." "Instantly," writes Lord Macaulay, "a troop of the Lords of the Bedchamber, of Bishops who wished to be translated, and of Scotch peers who wished to be re-elected, made haste to change sides." The Bill had passed the Commons by large majorities. The King opposed it like a partisan, and when it was defeated in the Lords, cried: "Thank God! it is all over; the House has thrown out the Bill, so there is an end of Mr. Fox". The Ministers not resigning, as the King expected they would, his Majesty dismissed them at once, sending to Lord North, in the middle of the night, for his seals of office.

On the 27th December, 1783, William Pitt, then twenty-four years of age, became Prime Minister of England. The House of Commons passed a resolution, on the motion of Lord Surrey, remonstrating with the King for having permitted his sacred name to be unconstitutionally used in order to influence the deliberations of Parliament. More than once the Commons petitioned the King to dismiss Pitt from office. Pitt, with large majorities against him, wished to resign; but George III said: "If you resign, Mr. Pitt, I must resign too," and he again threatened, in the event of defeat, to abandon England, and retire to his Hanoverian dominions. Now our monarch, even if a king, would have no Hanoverian dominions to retire to.

In 1784, George Prince of Wales was over head and ears in debt, and the King, who appears to have hated him, refusing any aid, the Prince resorted to threats. Dr. Doran says: "A conversation is spoken of as having passed between the Queen and the Minister, in which he is reported as having said, 'I much fear, your Majesty, that the Prince, in his wild moments,

may allow expressions to escape him that may be injurious to the Crown'. 'There is little fear of that,' was the alleged reply of the Queen: 'he is too well aware of the consequences of such a course of conduct to himself. As regards that point, therefore, I can rely upon him.'"

Jesse says of the Prince of Wales that between eighteen and twenty, "to be carried home drunk, or to be taken into custody by the watch, were apparently no unfrequent episodes in the early part of the career of the Heir to the Throne. Under the auspices of his weak and frivolous uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, the Prince's conversation is said to have been a compound of the slang of grooms and the wanton vocabulary of a brothel." "When we hunt together," said the King to the Duke of Gloucester, "neither my son nor my brother speaks to me; and lately, where the chase ended at a little village where there was but a single post-chaise to be hired, my son and brother got into it, and drove off, leaving me to go home in a cart, if I could find one."

In 1784, £60,000 was voted by Parliament to defray the King's debts. In consequence of the large debts of the Prince of Wales, an interview was arranged at Carlton House on the 27th April, 1785, between the Prince and Lord Malmesbury. The King, the Prince said, had desired him to send in an exact statement of his debts; there was one item, however, of £25,000, on which the Prince of Wales would give no information. If it were a debt, argued the King, which his son was ashamed to explain, it was one which the King ought not to defray. The Prince threatened to go abroad, saying, "I am ruined if I stay in England. I shall disgrace myself as a man; my father hates me, and has hated me since I was seven years old. . . . We are too wide asunder ever to meet. The King has deceived me; he has made me deceive others. I cannot trust him, and he will not believe me." And this is the Brunswick family to which the English nation is required to be blindly loyal!

In 1785 George Prince of Wales was married to a Roman Catholic lady, Mrs. Fitzherbert, a widow. It is of course known that the Prince treated the lady badly. This was not

his first experience, the history of Mary Robinson forming but one amongst a long list of shabby *liaisons*. A question having arisen before the House of Commons, during a discussion on the debts owing by the Prince, Charles James Fox, on the written authority of the Prince, denied that any marriage, regular or irregular, had ever taken place, and termed it "an invention . . . destitute of the slightest foundation". Mr. Fox's denial was made on the distinct written authority of the Prince, who offered, through Fox, to give in the House of Lords, the "fullest assurances of the utter falsehood" of the allegation; although not only does everybody know to-day that the denial was untrue, but, in point of fact, the fullest proofs of the denied marriage exist at this very moment in the custody of Messrs. Coutts, the bankers. Out of all the Brunswicks England has been cursed with, George I is the only one against whom there is no charge of wanton falsehood to his ministers or subjects, and it is fairly probable that his character for such truthfulness was preserved by his utter inability to talk our language.

Not only did George Prince of Wales thus deny his marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert, but he repeated voluntarily the denial after he became King George IV. Despite this denial, the King's executors, the Duke of Wellington and Sir William Knighton, were compelled by Mrs. Fitzherbert to admit the proofs. The marriage took place on the 21st December, 1785, and Mrs. Fitzherbert being a Roman Catholic, the legal effect was to bar Prince George, and prevent him ever becoming the lawful King of England. The documents above referred to as being at Coutts' include—1. The marriage certificate. 2. A letter written by the Prince of Wales acknowledging the marriage. 3. A will, signed by him, also acknowledging it, and other documents. And yet George, our King, whom Mr. Disraeli praises, authorised Charles James Fox to declare the rumor of his marriage "a low, malicious falsehood"; and then the Prince went to Mrs. Fitzherbert, and like a mean, lying hypocrite as he was, said: "O Maria, only conceive what Fox did

yesterday, he went down to the House, and denied that you and I were man and wife ”.

In 1786, £210,000 was voted for payment of the King's debts. Although when George Prince of Wales had attained his majority, he had an allowance of £50,000 a year, £60,000 to furnish Carlton House, and an additional £40,000 for cash to start with, yet he was soon after deep in debt, and in 1786, an execution was levied on his furniture for a debt of £600. In 1787, £160,000 was voted, and a portion of the Prince's debts was paid. £20,000 further was added as a vote for Carlton House. Thackeray says: “Lovers of long sums have added up the millions and millions which in the course of his brilliant existence this single Prince consumed. Besides his income of £50,000, £70,000, £100,000, £120,000 a year, we read of three applications to Parliament; debts to the amount of £160,000, of £650,000, besides mysterious foreign loans, whereof he pocketed the proceeds. What did he do for all this money? Why was he to have it? If he had been a manufacturing town, or a populous rural district, or an army of five thousand men, he would not have cost more. He, one solitary stout man, who did not toil, nor spin, nor fight—what had any mortal done that he should be pampered so?”

The proposed impeachment of Warren Hastings, which actually commenced on February 13th, 1788, and which did not conclude until eight years afterwards, excited considerable feeling, it being roundly alleged that Court protection had been purchased by the late Governor-General of India by means of a large diamond presented to the King. The following rhymed squib was sung about the streets to the tune of “Derry Down” :—

“ I'll sing you a song of a diamond so fine,
That soon in the crown of a monarch will shine ;
Of its size and its value the whole country rings,
By Hastings bestowed on the best of all Kings.
Derry down, etc.

“ From India this jewel was lately brought o'er,
Though sunk in the sea, it was found on the shore,
And just in the nick of St. James's it got,
Conveyed in a bag by the brave Major Scott.
Derry down, etc.

" Lord Sidney stepp'd forth, when the tidings were known,
It's his office to carry such news to the throne ;—
Though quite out of breath, to the closet he ran,
And stammer'd with joy ere his tale he began.

Derry down, etc.

" ' Here's a jewel, my liege, there's none such in the land :
Major Scott, with three bows, put it into my hand ;
And he swore when he gave it, the wise ones were bit,
For it never was shown to Dundas or to Pitt.'

Derry down, etc.

" ' For Dundas,' cried our sovereign, ' unpolished and rough,
Give him a Scotch pebble, it's more than enough.
And jewels to Pitt, Hastings justly refuses,
For he has already more gifts than he uses.

Derry down, etc.

" ' But run, Jenky, run ! ' adds the King in delight,
' Bring the Queen and Princesses here for a sight ;
They never would pardon the negligence shown,
If we kept from their knowledge so glorious a stone.

Derry down, etc.

" ' But guard the door, Jenky, no credit we'll win,
If the Prince in a frolic should chance to step in :
The boy to such secrets of State we'll ne'er call,
Let him wait till he gets our crown, income, and all.'

Derry down, etc.

" In the Princesses run, and surprised cry, ' O la !
' Tis as big as the egg of a pigeon, papa ! '
' And a pigeon of plumage worth plucking is he,'
Replies our good monarch, ' who sent it to me.'

Derry down, etc.

" Madame Schwellenberg peep'd through the door at the chink,
And tipp'd on the diamond a sly German wink ;
As much as to say, ' Can we ever be cruel
To him who has sent us so glorious a jewel ? '

Derry down, etc.

" Now, God save the Queen ! while the people I teach,
How the King may grow rich while the Commons impeach ;
Then let nabobs go plunder, and rob as they will,
And throw in their diamonds as grist to his mill.

Derry down, etc."

It was believed that the King had received not one diamond, but a large quantity, and that they were to be the purchase-money of Hastings' acquittal. Caricatures on the subject were

to be seen in the window of every print-shop. In one of these Hastings was represented wheeling away in a barrow the King, with his crown and sceptre, observing: "What a man buys, he may sell"; and, in another, the King was exhibited on his knees, with his mouth wide open, and Warren Hastings pitching diamonds into it. Many other prints, some of them bearing evidence of the style of the best caricaturists of the day, kept up the agitation on this subject. It happened that there was a quack in the town, who pretended to eat stones, and bills of his exhibition were placarded on the walls, headed in great letters, "The great stone eater!" The caricaturists took the hint, and drew the King with a diamond between his teeth, and a heap of others before him, with the inscription, "The greatest stone eater".

We borrow from Lord Macaulay to enable our readers to judge, in brief space, the nature of Warren Hastings' position, standing impeached, as he did, on a long string of charges, some of them most terrible in their implication of violence, falsehood, fraud, and rapacity. Macaulay thus pictures the situation between the civilised Christian and his tributaries: "On one side was a band of English functionaries, daring, intelligent, eager to be rich. On the other side was a great native population, helpless, timid, and accustomed to crouch under oppression." When some new act of rapacity was resisted there came war; but a "war of Bengalese against Englishmen was like a war of sheep against wolves, and men against demons. There was a long period before anyone dreamed that justice and morality should be features of English rule in India. "During the interval, the business of a servant of the Company was simply to wring out of the natives a hundred or two hundred thousand pounds as speedily as possible, that he might return home before his constitution had suffered from the heat, to marry a peer's daughter, to buy rotten boroughs in Cornwall, and to give balls in St. James's Square." Hastings was compelled to turn his attention to foreign affairs. The object of his diplomacy was at this time simply to get money. The finances of his government were in an embarrassed state, and this embarrassment he was deter-

mined to relieve by some means, fair or foul. The principle which directed all his dealings with his neighbours is fully expressed by the old motto of one of the great predatory families of Teviotdale—"Thou shalt want ere I want". He seems to have laid it down, as a fundamental proposition which could not be disputed, that, when he had not as many lacs of rupees as the public service required, he was to take them from anybody who had. One thing, indeed, is to be said in excuse for him. The pressure applied to him by his employers at home was such as only the highest virtue could have withstood, such as left him no choice except to commit great wrongs, or to resign his high post, and with that post all his hopes of fortune and distinction. "Hastings was in need of funds to carry on the government of Bengal, and to send remittances to London; and Sujah Dowlah had an ample revenue. Sujah Dowlah was bent on subjugating the Rohillas, and Hastings had at his disposal the only force by which the Rohillas could be subjugated. It was agreed that an English army should be lent to Nabob Vizier, and that for the loan he should pay four hundred thousand pounds sterling, besides defraying all the charge of the troops while employed in his service. 'I really cannot see,' says Mr. Gleig, 'upon what grounds, either of political or moral justice, this proposition deserves to be stigmatised as infamous.' If we understand the meaning of words, it is infamous to commit a wicked action for hire, and it is wicked to engage in war without provocation. In this particular war, scarcely one aggravating circumstance was wanting. The object of the Rohilla war was this—to deprive a large population, who had never done us the least harm, of a good government, and to place them, against their will, under an execrably bad one . . . The horrors of Indian war were let loose on the fair valleys and cities of Rohilcund. The whole country was in a blaze. More than a hundred thousand people fled from their homes to pestilential jungles, preferring famine and fever, and the haunts of tigers, to the tyranny of him to whom an English and a Christian government had, for shameful lucre, sold their substance, and their blood, and the honor of their

wives and daughters Mr. Hastings had only to put down by main force the brave struggles of innocent men fighting for their liberty. Their military resistance crushed, his duties ended; and he had then only to fold his arms and look on, while their villages were burned, their children butchered, and their women violated We hasten to the end of this sad and disgraceful story. The war ceased. The finest population of India was subjected to a greedy, cowardly, cruel tyrant. Commerce and agriculture languished. The rich province which had tempted the cupidity of Sujah Dowlah became the most miserable part even of his miserable dominions. Yet is the injured nation not extinct. At long intervals gleams of its ancient spirit have flashed forth; and even at this day valor, and self-respect, and a chivalrous feeling rare among Asiatics, and a bitter remembrance of the great crime of England, distinguish that noble Afghan race."

Partly in consequence of the proposed legislation by Fox on the affairs of the East India Company, and partly from personal antagonism, members of the Indian Council hostile to Governor-General Hastings were sent out to India. Amongst his most prominent antagonists was Francis, the reputed author of *Junius's Letters*. It was to Francis especially that the Maharajah Nuncomar of Bengal addressed himself. "He put into the hands of Francis, with great ceremony, a paper containing several charges of the most serious description. By this document Hastings was accused of putting offices up to sale, and of receiving bribes for suffering offenders to escape. In particular, it was alleged that Mahommed Reza Khan had been dismissed with impunity, in consideration of a great sum paid to the Governor-General. . . . He stated that Hastings had received a large sum for appointing Rajah Goordas treasurer of the Nabob's household, and for committing the care of his Highness's person to Munny Begum. He put in a letter purporting to bear the seal of the Munny Begum, for the purpose of establishing the truth of his story."

Much evidence was taken before the Indian Council, where there was considerable conflict between the friends and enemies of Hastings. "The majority, however, voted that the charge

was made out: that Hastings had corruptly received between thirty and forty thousand pounds: and that he ought to be compelled to refund."

Now, however, comes an item darker and more disgraceful, if possible, than what had preceded.

"On a sudden, Calcutta was astonished by the news that Nuncomar had been taken up on a charge of felony, committed, and thrown into the common gaol. The crime imputed to him was, that six years before he had forged a bond. The ostensible prosecutor was a native. But it was then, and still is, the opinion of everybody, idiots and biographers excepted, that Hastings was the real mover in the business." The Chief-Justice Impey, one of Hastings' creatures, pushed on a mock trial, "a verdict of Guilty was returned, and the Chief-Justice pronounced sentence of death on the prisoner. . . . Of Impey's conduct it is impossible to speak too severely. He acted unjustly in refusing to respite Nuncomar. No rational man can doubt that he took this course in order to gratify the Governor-General. If we had ever had any doubts on that point, they would have been dispelled by a letter which Mr. Gleig has published. Hastings, three or four years later, described Impey as the man 'to whose support he was at one time indebted for the safety of his fortune, honor and reputation.' These strong words can refer only to the case of Nuncomar; and they must mean that Impey hanged Nuncomar in order to support Hastings. It is, therefore, our deliberate opinion that Impey, sitting as a judge, put a man unjustly to death in order to serve a political purpose."

Encouraged by success, a few years later, Hastings, upon the most unfair pretext, made war upon and plundered the Raja of Benares, and a little later subjected the eunuchs of the Begums of Oude to physical torture to make them confess where the royal treasure was hidden.

It is evident from Miss Burney's diary that the King and Queen warmly championed the cause of Warren Hastings, who, after a wearisome impeachment was acquitted.

In 1788, the King's insanity assumed a more violent form than usual, and on a report from the Privy Council, the

subject was brought before Parliament. In the Commons, Pitt and the Tory party contended that the right of providing for the government of the country in cases where the monarch was unable to perform his duties, belonged to the nation at large, to be exercised by its representatives in Parliament. Fox and the Whigs, on the other hand, maintained that the Prince of Wales possessed the inherent right to assume the government. Pitt, seizing this argument as it fell from Fox, said, at the moment, to the member seated nearest to him: "I'll unwhig the gentleman for the rest of his life".

During the discussions of the Regency Bill, Lord Thurlow, then Lord Chancellor, coquetted with both parties. When the King's recovery was announced by the royal physicians, Thurlow, to cover his treachery, made an extravagant speech, laudatory of the King, and in defence of Pitt's views. After enumerating the rewards received from the King, he said: "And if I forget the monarch who has thus befriended me, may my great Creator forget me". John Wilkes, who was present in the House of Lords, said in a stage aside, audible to many of the peers: "Forget you, he will see you damned first". Phillimore declares that Lord Chancellor Thurlow "either from an instinctive delight in all that was brutal" (which did not prevent him from being a gross hypocrite), "or from a desire to please George III—supported the Slave Trade, and the horrors of the Middle Passage with the uncompromising ferocity of a Liverpool merchant or a Guinea captain".

The Prince of Wales and the Duke of York exhibited indecent eagerness to have the King declared irrecoverably insane, and on more than one occasion the Queen refused to allow either of these Royal Princes access to the King's person, on the ground that their violent conduct retarded his recovery. The Prince of Wales and the Duke of York protested in writing against the Queen's hostility to them, and published the protest. Happy family, these Brunswicks! Dr. Doran declares: "There was assuredly no decency in the conduct of the Heir-apparent, or of his next brother. They were

gaily flying from club to club, party to party, and did not take the trouble even to assume the sentiment which they could not feel. 'If we were together,' says Lord Granville, in a letter inserted in his Memoirs, 'I would tell you some particulars of the Prince of Wales's behaviour to the King and Queen, within these few days, that would make your blood run cold.' It was said that if the King could only recover and learn what had been said and done during his illness, he would hear enough to drive him again into insanity. The conduct of his eldest sons was marked by a savage inhumanity." Jesse says: "The fact is a painful one to relate, that on the 4th December—the day on which Parliament assembled, and when the King's malady was at its worst—the graceless youth (the Duke of York) not only held a meeting of the Opposition at his own house, but afterwards proceeded to the House of Lords, in order to hear the depositions of the royal physicians read, and to listen to the painful details of his father's lunacy. Moreover, the same evening we track both the brothers (the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York) to Brookes's, where in a circle of boon companions, as irreverent as themselves, they are said to have been in the habit of indulging in the most shocking indecencies, of which the King's derangement was the topic. On such occasions, we are told, not only did they turn their parents into ridicule, and blab the secrets of the chamber of sickness at Windsor, but the Prince even went to such unnatural lengths as to employ his talents for mimicry, in which he was surpassed by few of his contemporaries, in imitating the ravings and gestures of his stricken father. As for the Duke of York, we are assured 'that the brutality of the stupid sot disgusted even the most profligate of his associates'." Even after the King's return to reason had been vouched by the physicians, William Grenville, writing to Lord Buckingham, says that the two princes "amused themselves with spreading the report that the King was still out of his mind". When the great thanksgiving for the King's recovery took place at Saint Paul's, the conduct of the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York, in the Cathedral itself, is described "as having been in the highest degree irreverent,

if not indecent". Sir William Young writes to Lord Buckingham: "The day will come when Englishmen will bring these Princes to their senses". Alas, for England, the day has not yet come!

In 1789, a great outcry was raised against the Duke of York on account of his licentiousness. In 1790, the printer of the *Times* newspaper was fined £100 for libelling the Prince of Wales, and a second £100 for libelling the Duke of York. It was in this year that the Prince of Wales and the Dukes of York and Clarence issued joint and several bonds to an enormous amount—it is said £1,000,000 sterling, and bearing six per cent interest. These bonds were taken up chiefly abroad; and some Frenchmen who subscribed, being unable to obtain either principal or interest, applied to the Court of Chancery, in order to charge the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall. Others of the foreign holders of bonds had resource to other proceedings to enforce their claims. In nearly every case the claimants were arrested by the Secretary of State's order, and sent out of England under the Alien Act, and when landed in their own country were again arrested for treasonable communication with the enemy, and perished on the scaffold. MM. De Baume, Chaudot, Mette, Aubert, Vaucher, and others, all creditors of the Prince, were thus arrested under the Duke of Portland's warrant, and on their deportation re-arrested for treason, and guillotined. Thus were some of the debts of the Royal Family of Brunswick settled, if not paid. Honest family, these Brunswicks!

George Prince of Wales and Frederick Duke of York were constant patrons of prize fights, races and gambling tables, largely betting and not always paying their wagers when they lost. In the autumn of 1791 a charge was made against the Prince of Wales that he allowed his horse, Escape, to run badly on the 20th of October, and when heavily betted against caused the same horse to be ridden to win. A brother of Lord Lake, who was friendly to the Prince, and who managed some of his racing affairs, evidently believed there was foul play, and so did the Jockey Club, who declared that if the Prince permitted the same jockey, Samuel Chifney, to ride again, no gentleman

would start against him. A writer employed by George Prince of Wales to defend his character says: "It may be asked, why did not the Prince of Wales declare upon his honor that no foul play had been used with respect to Escape's first race? Such a declaration would at once have solved all difficulties, and put an end to all embarrassments. But was it proper for the Prince of Wales to have condescended to such a submission? Are there not sometimes suspicions of so disgraceful a nature afloat, and at the same time so improbable withal, that if the person who is the object of them condescends to reply to them, he degrades himself? Was it to be expected of the Prince of Wales that he should purge himself, by oath, like his domestic? Or was it to be looked for, that the first subject in the realm, the personage whose simple word should have commanded deference, respect and belief, was to submit himself to the examination of the Jockey Club, and answer such questions as they might have thought proper to have proposed to him?"

This, coming from a family like the Brunswicks, and from one of four brothers, highnesses of Wales, York, Kent, and Cumberland, who had each in turn declared himself upon honor not guilty of some misdemeanor or felony, is worthy a note of admiration. George, Prince of Wales, declared himself not guilty of bigamy; the Duke of York declared himself not guilty of selling promotion in the army. Both these Princes publicly declared themselves not guilty of the charge of trying to hinder their royal father's restoration to sanity. The Duke of Kent, the Queen's father, declared that he was no party to the subornation of witnesses against his own brother. The Duke of Cumberland pledged his oath that he had never been guilty of sodomy and murder.

In September, 1791, the Duke of York was married to the Princess Frederica, daughter of the King of Prussia, with whom he lived most unhappily for a few years. The only effect of this marriage on the nation was that £18,000 a year was voted as an extra allowance to His Royal Highness the Duke of York. This was in addition to 100,000 crowns given out of the Civil List as a marriage portion to the Princess. Dr. Norman says of the Duchess of York: "For six years

she bore with treatment from the 'Commander-in-Chief' such as no trooper under him would have inflicted on a wife equally deserving. At the end of that time the ill-matched pair separated." Kind husbands, these Brunswicks!

In a print published on the 24th May, 1792, entitled "*Vices Overlooked in the New Proclamation*," *Avarice* is represented by King George and Queen Charlotte, hugging their hoarded millions with extreme satisfaction, a book of interest tables lying at hand. The print is divided into four compartments, representing: 1. *Avarice*; 2. *Drunkenness*, exemplified in the person of the Prince of Wales; 3. *Gambling*, the favorite amusement of the Duke of York; and 4. *Debauchery*, the Duke of Clarence and Mrs. Jordan—as the four notable vices of the Royal Family of Great Britain. If the print had to be re-issued to-day, it would require no vivid imagination to provide materials from the living members of the Royal Family to refill the four compartments.

Amongst remarkable trials in 1792, those of Daniel Hold and William Winterbottom illustrate the fashion in which the rule of the Brunswick monarchy has trenched on our political liberties. The former, a Nottingham printer, was convicted and sentenced to two years' imprisonment for republishing, verbatim, a political tract, originally circulated without prosecution by the Thatched House Tavern Association, of which Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond had been members. The other, a dissenting minister at Plymouth, of highly respectable character, was convicted of sedition, and sentenced to four years' imprisonment in the gaol of Newgate, for two sermons preached in commemoration of the revolution of 1688. The indictment charged him with affirming: "That his Majesty was placed upon the throne on condition of keeping certain laws and rules, and if he does not observe them, he has no more right to the Crown than the Stuarts had". All the Whigs in the kingdom might, doubtless, have been comprehended in a similar indictment. And if the doctrine affirmed by the Rev. Mr. Winterbottom be denied, the monstrous reverse of the proposition follows, that the King is bound by no conditions or laws; and that, though resistance

to the tyranny of the Stuarts might be justifiable, resistance under the same circumstances to the House of Brunswick is not. This trial, for the cruelty and infamy attending it, has been justly compared to the celebrated one of Rosewell, in the latter years of Charles II, to the events of which those of 1792 exhibit, in various respects, a striking and alarming parallel.

Before his election to the National Convention, Thomas Paine published the second part of his "Rights of Man", in which he boldly promulgated principles which, though fiercely condemned at the date of their issue, are now being gradually accepted by the great mass of the people. Paine's work was spread through the kingdom with extraordinary industry, and was greedily sought for by people of all classes. Despite the great risk of fine and imprisonment, some of the most effective parts were printed on pieces of paper, which were used by Republican tradesmen as wrappers for their commodities. Proceedings were immediately taken against Thomas Paine as author of the obnoxious book, which was treated as a libel against the Government and Constitution, and on trial Paine was found guilty. He was defended with great ability by Erskine, who, when he left the court, was cheered by a crowd of people who had collected without, some of whom took his horses from his carriage, and dragged him home to his house in Serjeant's Inn. The name and opinions of Thomas Paine were at this moment gaining influence, in spite of the exertion made to put them down. From this time for several years, it is almost impossible to read a weekly journal without finding some instance of prosecution for publishing Paine's political views.

The trial of Thomas Paine was the commencement of a series of State prosecutions, not for political offences, but for political designs. The name of Paine had caused much apprehension, but many even amongst the Conservatives dreaded the extension of the practice of making the publications of a man's abstract opinions criminal, when unaccompanied by any direct or open attempt to put them into effect. In the beginning of 1793 followed prosecutions in Edinburgh, where the Ministerial influence was great, against men who had asso-

ciated to do little more than call for reform in Parliament; and five persons, whose alleged crimes consisted chiefly in having read Paine's "Rights of Man", and in having expressed either a partial approbation of his doctrines, or a strong declaration in favor of Parliamentary reform, were transported severally—Joseph Gerald, William Skirving, and Thomas Muir for fourteen, and Thomas Fyshe Palmer and Maurice Margarot for seven years! These men had been active in the political societies, and it was imagined that, by an exemplary injustice of this kind, these societies would be intimidated. Such, however, was not the case, for, from this moment, the clubs in Edinburgh became more active than ever, and they certainly took a more dangerous character; so that, before the end of the year, there was actually a "British Convention" sitting in the Scottish capital. This was dissolved by force at the beginning of 1794, and two of its members were added to the convicts already destined for transportation. Their severe sentences provoked warm discussions in the English Parliament, but the ministers were inexorable in their resolution to put them into execution.

The extreme severity of the sentences passed on the Scottish political martyrs, even as judged by those admitting the legality and justice of their conviction, was so shameful as to rouse general interest. Barbarous as the law of Scotland appeared to be, it became a matter of doubt whether the Court of Justiciary had not exceeded its power in substituting the punishment of transportation for that of banishment, imposed by the Act of Queen Anne, for the offence charged on those men.

In 1794, the debts of the Prince of Wales, then amounting to about £650,000, not including the amounts due on the foreign bonds, a marriage was suggested in order to give an excuse for going to Parliament for a vote. This was at a time when the Prince was living with Mrs. Fitzherbert as his wife, and when Lady Jersey was his most prominent mistress. The bride selected was Caroline of Brunswick. A poor woman for a wife, if Lord Malmesbury's picture is a true one, certainly in no sense a bad woman. But her husband, our prince! When she

arrived in London George was not sober. His first words, after greeting her, were to Lord Malmesbury: "Get me a glass of brandy". Tipsy this Brunswicker went to the altar on April 8th, 1794; so tipsy that he got up from his knees too soon, and the King had to whisper him down, the Archbishop having halted in amaze in the ceremony. Here there is no possibility of mistake. The two dukes who were his best men at the wedding had their work to keep him from falling; and to one, the Duke of Bedford, he admitted that he had had several glasses of brandy before coming to the chapel.

Thackeray says: "What could be expected from a wedding which had such a beginning—from such a bridegroom and such a bride? Malmesbury gives us the beginning of the marriage story—how the Prince reeled into chapel to be married; how he hiccupped out his vows of fidelity—you know how he kept them; how he pursued the woman whom he had married; to what a state he brought her; with what blows he struck her; with what malignity he pursued her; what his treatment of his daughter was; and what his own life. *He* the first gentleman of Europe!"

The Parliament not only paid the Prince of Wales's debts, but gave him £28,000 for jewels and plate, and £26,000 for the furnishing of Carlton House.

On the 12th of May Mr. Henry Dundas brought down to the Commons a message from the King that seditious practices had been carried on by certain societies in London, in correspondence with other societies; that they had lately been pursued with increasing activity and boldness, and had been avowedly directed to the assembling of a pretended National Convention, in contempt and defiance of the authority of Parliament, on principles subversive of the existing laws and the constitution, and tending to introduce that system of anarchy prevailing in France; that his Majesty had given orders for seizing the books and papers of those societies, which were to be laid before the House, to whom it was recommended to pursue measures necessary to counteract their pernicious tendency. A large collection of books and papers was, in consequence, brought down to the House, and referred to a com-

mittee of secrecy. A few days after, the following persons were committed to the Tower on a charge of high treason :—Mr. Thomas Hardy, a shoemaker in Piccadilly, who officiated as Secretary to the London Corresponding Society; Mr. Daniel Adams, Secretary to the Society for Constitutional Information; Mr. John Horne Tooke; Mr. Stewart Kidd; Mr. Jeremiah Joyce, preceptor to Lord Mahon, eldest son of the Earl of Stanhope; and Mr. John Thelwall, who had for some time delivered lectures on political subjects in London.

Under the influence of excitement resulting from the Government statement of the discovery of a plot to assassinate the King, which plot never existed outside the brains of the Government spies, a Special Commission of Oyer and Terminer was issued on the 10th of September, 1794, for the trial of the State prisoners confined in the Tower on a charge of high treason. On the 2nd of October the Commission was opened at the Session House, Clerkenwell, by Lord Chief Justice Eyre, in an elaborate charge to the grand jury. Bills were then found against all who had been arrested in May, except Daniel Adams. Hardy was first put on his trial at the Old Bailey. The trial commenced on the 28th of October, and continued with short adjournments until the 5th of November. Mr. Erskine was counsel for Hardy, and employed his great talents and brilliant eloquence with the most complete success. After consulting together for three hours, the jury, though the avowed friends of the then administration, returned a verdict of Not Guilty. There has seldom been a verdict given in a British court of justice which afforded more general satisfaction. It is doubtful whether there has been any verdict more important in its consequences to the liberties of the English people. On the 17th of November John Horne Tooke was put on his trial. The Duke of Richmond, Earl Camden, Mr. Pitt, and Mr. Beaufoy, were subpœnaed by the prisoner; and the examination of William Pitt by Mr. Tooke and his counsel formed the most important feature in the trial, as the evidence of the Prime Minister tended to prove, that from the year 1780 to 1782, he himself had been actively engaged with Mr. Tooke and many others in measures of agitation to procure a Parliamentary

reform, although he now not only deemed the attempt dangerous and improper, but sought to condemn it as treasonable, or at least as seditious. Mr. Erskine, who was counsel for Mr. Tooke also, in a most eloquent and powerful manner contended that the conduct of his client was directed only to the same object as that previously sought by Pitt himself, and that the measures resorted to, so far from being criminal, were perfectly constitutional. Mr. Pitt was extremely guarded in his replies and professed very little recollection of what passed at the meetings which he attended. A letter he had written to Mr. Tooke at that time on the subject was handed to him, which he pretended he could scarcely recognise, and which the judge would not permit to be read. Mr. Sheridan, who was likewise engaged in the agitation for political reform, and subpœnaed by Mr. Tooke, gave unqualified evidence in favor of Mr. Tooke respecting the proceedings of those meetings. The trial continued till the Saturday following, when the jury were out of court only six minutes, and returned a verdict of Not Guilty!

The opening of Parliament was looked forward to with great anxiety, on account of the extreme distress under which the country was laboring. As the time approached, popular meetings were held in the metropolis, and preparations were made for an imposing demonstration. During the morning of the 29th of October, the day on which the King was to open the session in person, crowds of men continued pouring into the town from the various open spaces outside, where simultaneous meetings had been called by placards and advertisements; and before the King left Buckingham House, on his way to St. James's, the number of people collected on the ground over which he had to pass is admitted in the papers of the day to have been not less than two hundred thousand. At first the state carriage was allowed to move on through this dense mass in sullen silence, no hats being taken off, nor any other mark of respect being shown. Then came a general outburst of hisses and groans, mingled with shouts of "Give us peace and bread!" "No war!" "No King!" "Down with him!" "Down with George!" and the like; and this tumult continued unabated until the King reached the House of Lords, the Guards with

difficulty keeping the mob from closing on the carriage. As it passed through Margaret Street the populace seemed determined to attack it, and when opposite the Ordnance Office a stone passed through the glass of the carriage window. A verse published the following day says :—

“ Folks say it was lucky the stone missed the head,
When lately at Cæsar 'twas thrown ;
I think very different from thousands indeed,
'Twas a lucky escape for the stone.”

The demonstration was even more fierce on the King's return and he had some difficulty in reaching St. James's Palace without injury ; for the mob threw stones at the State carriage and damaged it considerably. After remaining a short time at St. James's, he proceeded in his private coach to Buckingham House, but the carriage was stopped in the Park by the populace, who pressed round it, shouting “ Bread, bread ! Peace, peace ! ” until the King was rescued from this unpleasant situation by a strong body of the Guards.

Treason and Sedition Acts were hurried through Parliament to repress the cries of the hungry for bread, whilst additional taxes were imposed to make the poor poorer.

That the terrible French war—of which it is impossible to give any account in the limits of this essay, a war which cost Great Britain at least £1,000,000,000 in hard cash, without reckoning the hundreds of thousands of killed, wounded, and pauperised, and which Buckle calls “ the most hateful, the most unjust, and the most atrocious war England has ever waged against any country ”—directly resulted from our Government under the Brunswick family, is a point on which it is impossible for anyone who has examined the facts, to have serious doubt. Sir Archibald Alison tells us that early in 1791 : “ The King of England took a vivid interest in the misfortunes of the Royal Family of France, promising, as Elector of Hanover, to concur in any measures which might be deemed necessary to extricate them from their embarrassments ; and he sent Lord Elgin to Leopold, who was then travelling in Italy, to concert measures for the common object ”. It was as Elector of Hanover also that his grandfather, George II, had sacrificed English honor

and welfare to the personal interests and family connexions of these wretched Brunswicks. It is certain, too, that after years of terrible war, on one of the occasions of negotiation for peace, hindrances arose because our Government insisted on describing George III, in the preliminaries, as "King of France". The French naturally said: First, your King George has never been King of any part of France at any time; and next, we, having just declared France a Republic, cannot in a solemn treaty recognise the continued existence of a claim to Monarchy over us. It was not until the year 1800 that the title "King of France" was abandoned by George IV, and the *fleur de lys* erased from the royal arms.

The following table shows how the labor of the British nation was burdened for generations to come by the insane affection of the House of Brunswick for the House of Bourbon:

YEARS.			TAXES.			LOANS.
1793	£17,656,418	£25,926,526
1794	17,170,400	—
1795	17,308,411	51,705,698
1796	17,858,454	56,945,568
1797	18,737,760	25,350,000
1798	20,654,650	35,624,250
1799	30,202,915	21,875,300
1800	35,229,968	29,045,000
1801	33,896,464	44,816,250
1802	35,415,296	41,489,438
1803	37,240,213	16,000,000
1804	37,677,063	18,200,000
1805	45,359,442	39,543,124
1806	49,659,281	29,880,000
1807	53,304,254	18,373,200
1808	58,390,255	13,693,254
1809	61,538,207	21,278,122
1810	63,405,294	19,811,108
1811	66,681,366	29,244,711
1812	64,763,870	40,743,031
1813	63,169,845	54,780,324
1814	66,925,835	63,645,930
1815	69,684,192	70,888,402
Total	£981,929,853	£768,858,934

The actual naval and military expenditure for the foregoing years is £989,636,449.

After making some deductions on account of the operations

of the *loyalty loan*, and the transfer of annuities, the total debt contracted from 1793 to 1815 amounts to £762,537,445. If to this sum be added the increase in the unfunded debt during that period, and the additional sums raised by taxes in consequence of hostilities, we shall have the total expenditure, owing to the French War, as follows :

Debt contracted from 1793 to 1815	£762,537,445
Increase in the Unfunded Debt	50,104,060
War Taxes	614,488,459
Total	1,427,129,964
Deduct sum paid to the Commissioners for reduction of the National Debt	173,309,383
Total cost of the French War	£1,253,820,581

Lord Fife, in the House of Lords, said that “in this horrid war he had first witnessed the blood and treasure of the nation expended in the extravagant folly of secret expeditions, which had invariably proved either abortive or unsuccessful. Grievous and heavy taxes had been laid on the people, and wasted in expensive embassies, and in subsidising proud, treacherous, and useless foreign princes”.

In 1795, King George and his advisers tried by statute to put a stop for ever in this country to all political or religious discussion. No meeting was to be held, except on five days' duly advertised notice, to be signed by householders; and if for lectures or debates, on special licence by a magistrate. Power was given to any magistrate to put an end in his discretion to any meeting, and to use military force in the event of twelve persons remaining one hour after notice. If a man lent books, newspapers, or pamphlets, without license, he might be fined twenty pounds for every offence. If he permitted lectures or debates on any subject whatever, he might be fined one hundred pounds a day. And yet people dare to tell us that we owe our liberties to these Brunswicks.

On the 1st of June, 1795, Gillray, in a caricature entitled “John Bull Ground Down”, represented Pitt grinding John Bull into money, which was flowing out in an immense stream beneath the mill. The Prince of Wales is drawing off a large

portion to pay the debts incurred by his extravagance; while Dundas, Burke, and Loughborough, as the representatives of ministerial pensioners, are scrambling for the rest. King George encourages Pitt to grind without mercy. Another caricature by Gillray, published on the 4th of June, represents Pitt as Death on the White Horse (the horse of Hanover) riding over a drove of pigs, representatives of those whom Burke had termed the "swinish multitude".

On the 7th January, 1796, the Princess Charlotte of Wales was born, and on the 30th of April, George Prince of Wales wrote to the Princess Caroline, stating that he did not intend to live with her any more. The Prince had some time previously sent by Lord Cholmondeley a verbal message to the same effect, which the Princess had refused to accept. The mistress reigning over the Prince of Wales at this time was Lady Jersey.

During the American War, when there were no troops in Ireland, and when, under Flood and Grattan, the volunteers were in arms, some concessions had been made to the Irish people. A few obnoxious laws had been repealed, and promises had been held out of some relaxation of the fearfully oppressive laws against the Catholics. From the correspondence of Earl Temple it is clear that in 1782 not only was the King against any further concessions whatever, but that his Majesty and Lord Shelburne actually manœuvred to render the steps already taken as fruitless as possible. We find W. W. Grenville admitting, on the 15th December, 1782: "that the [Irish] people are really miserable and oppressed to a degree I had not at all conceived". The Government acted dishonestly to Ireland. The consequence was continued misery and disaffection, and this state of things is directly traceable to the King's wilfulness on Irish affairs. It illustrates the character of the Government, that Lord Temple, when Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, wrote to his brother in cipher, because his letters were opened in the Post-office by Lord Shelburne. The Parliament of Ireland was in great part owned by absentee peers, and each change of Lord-Lieutenancy was marked by heavy addition to the Pension List. The continuance of the Catholic disabilities rendered permanent quiet impossible. Three-fourths of the nation were

legally and socially almost outlawed. The national discontent was excited by the arbitrary conduct of the authorities, and hopes of successful revolution were encouraged, after 1789, by the progress of the Revolution in France.

About 1790, the "United Irishmen" first began to be heard of. Their object was "a complete reform in the Legislature, founded on the principles of civil, political, and religious liberty". The clubs soon became secret associations, and were naturally soon betrayed. Prosecutions for sedition in 1793 were soon followed by military repression.

Lord Moira, in the House of Lords in 1797, in a powerful speech, which remained without refutation, described the Government of Ireland as "the most absurd as well as the most disgusting tyranny that any nation ever groaned under". He said: "If such a tyranny be persevered in, the consequence must inevitably be the deepest and most universal discontent, and even hatred to the English name. I have seen in that country a marked distinction made between the English and Irish. I have seen troops that have been sent full of prejudice—that every inhabitant in that kingdom is a rebel to the British Government. I have seen the most wanton insults practised upon men of all ranks and conditions. I have seen the most grievous oppressions exercised, in consequence of a presumption that the person who was the unfortunate object of such oppression was in hostility to the Government! and yet that has been done in a part of the country as quiet and as free from disturbance as the city of London." His lordship then observed that, "from education and early habits, the *curfew* was ever considered by Britons as a badge of slavery and oppression. It was then practised with brutal rigor. He had known an instance where the master of a house had in vain pleaded to be allowed the use of a candle, to enable the mother to administer relief to her daughter struggling in convulsive fits. In former times, it had been the custom for Englishmen to hold the infamous proceedings of the Inquisition in detestation. One of the greatest horrors with which it was attended was that the person, ignorant of the crime laid to his charge, or of his accuser, was torn from his family, immured in a prison, and

kept in the most cruel uncertainty as to the period of his confinement, or the fate which awaited him. To this injustice abhorred by Protestants in the practice of the Inquisition, were the people of Ireland exposed. All confidence, all security were taken away. When a man was taken up on suspicion, he was put to the torture; nay, if he were merely accused of concealing the guilt of another. The rack, indeed, was not at hand; but the punishment of picqueting was in practice, which had been for some years abolished as too inhuman, even in the dragoon service. He had known a man, in order to extort a confession of a supposed crime or of that of some of his neighbours, picqueted till he actually fainted—picqueted a second time till he fainted again, and, as soon as he came to himself, picqueted a third time till he once more fainted: and all upon mere suspicion! Nor was this the only species of torture. Men had been taken and hung up till they were half dead, and then threatened with a repetition of the cruel treatment, unless they made confession of the imputed guilt. These were not particular acts of cruelty exercised by men abusing the power committed to them, but they formed part of our system. They were notorious, and no person could say who would be the next victim of this oppression and cruelty, which he saw others endure. This, however, was not all; their lordships no doubt, would recollect the famous proclamation issued by a military commander in Ireland, requiring the people to give up their arms. It never was denied that this proclamation was illegal, though defended on some supposed necessity; but it was not surprising that some reluctance had been shown to comply with it by men who conceived the Constitution gave them a right to keep arms in their houses for their own defence; and they could not but feel indignation in being called upon to give up their right. In the execution of the order the greatest cruelties had been committed. If anyone was suspected to have concealed weapons of defence, his house, his furniture, and all his property, were burnt; but this was not all. If it were supposed that any district had not surrendered all the arms which it contained, a party was sent out to collect the number at which it was rated; and in execution of this order, thirty houses

were sometimes burnt down in a single night. Officers took upon themselves to decide discretionally the quantity of arms; and upon their opinions the fatal consequences followed. These facts were well known in Ireland, but they could not be made public through the channel of the newspapers, for fear of that summary mode of punishment which had been practised towards the *Northern Star*, when a party of troops in open day, and in a town where the General's headquarters were, went and destroyed all the offices and property belonging to that paper. It was thus authenticated accounts were suppressed."

Can anyone wonder that the ineffectual attempts at revolution of 1798 followed such a state of things? And when, in the *London Chronicle* and *Cambridge Intelligencer*, and other journals by no means favorable to Ireland or its people, we read the horrid stories of women ravished, men tortured, and farms pillaged, all in the name of law and order, and this by King George's soldiers, not more than seventy years ago, can we feel astonishment that the Wexford peasants have grown up to hate the Saxon oppressor? And this we owe to a family of kings who used their pretended Protestantism as a cloak for the illtreatment of our Catholic brethren in Ireland. In impeaching the Brunswicks, we remind the people of proclamations officially issued in the King's name, threatening to burn and devastate whole parishes, and we allege that this disaffection in Ireland at the present moment is the natural fruit of the utter regardlessness on the part of the Guelphs of human liberty, or happiness, or life. The grossest excesses were perpetrated in Ireland by King George III's foreign auxiliaries. The troops from Hesse Cassel, from Hesse Darmstadt, and from Hanover, earned an unenviable notoriety by their cruelty, rapacity, and licentiousness. And these we owe entirely to the Brunswicks.

A letter from the War Office, dated April 11th, 1798, shows how foreigners were specially selected for the regiments sent over to Ireland. Sir Ralph Abercromby publicly rebuked the King's army, of which he was the Commander-in-Chief, for its disgraceful irregularities and licentiousness. Even Lieutenant-General Lake admits that "the determination of the troops to

destroy everyone they think a rebel is beyond description, and needs correction”.

On the 12th July, 1799, an Act was passed by which the Societies of the United Englishmen, United Scotsmen, United Irishmen, and United Britons, and the said society commonly called the London Corresponding Society, and all other societies called Corresponding Societies of any other city, town, or place, were declared to be utterly suppressed and prohibited.

In 1801, it was announced that King George III was suffering from a severe cold and sore throat, and could not, therefore, go out in public. His disease, however, was more mental than bodily. Her present Majesty has also suffered from severe cold and sore throat, but except the declaration made by Mr. Disraeli in 1871, no allegation has been ventured that her mental condition is such as to unfit her for Royal duties.

On March 29th, 1802, the sum of £990,053 was voted for payment of the King's debts.

In 1803, the Prince of Wales being again in debt, a further vote was passed of £60,000 a year for three years and a half. Endeavors were made to increase this grant, but marvellous to relate, the House of Commons actually acted as if it had some slight interest in the welfare of the people, and rejected a motion of Mr. Calcraft for a further vote of money to enable his Royal Highness to maintain his state and dignity. The real effect of the vote actually carried was to provide for £800,649 of the Prince's debts, including the vote of 1794.

In 1804, the sum of £591,842 was voted for payment of the King's debts.

In 1804, King George was very mad, but Mr. Addington explained to Parliament that there was nothing in his Majesty's indisposition to prevent his discharging the Royal functions. Mr. Gladstone also recently explained to Parliament that there would be no delay in the prorogation of Parliament in consequence of her gracious Majesty's indisposition and absence.

In 1805, the House of Commons directed the criminal

prosecution of Lord Melville, for corrupt conduct and embezzlement of public money, as First Lord of the Admiralty. For this, however, impeachment was substituted, and on his trial before the House of Peers, he was acquitted, as out of 136 peers, only 59 said that they thought him guilty, although he had admitted the misapplication of £10,000.

In 1805, £10,458 was voted for the King's debts.

On the 29th of March, 1806, a warrant was signed by King George III, directed to Lord Chancellor Erskine, to Lord Grenville, the Prime Minister, to Lord Ellenborough, then Lord Chief Justice of England, and to Earl Spencer, commanding them to inquire into the conduct of Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales. Before these Lords, Charlotte Lady Douglas swore that she had visited the Princess, who confessed to having committed adultery, saying, "that she got a bedfellow whenever she could, that nothing was more wholesome". Lady Douglas further swore to the Princess's pregnancy, and evidence was given to prove that she had been delivered of a male child. The whole of this evidence was found to be perjury, and Lady Douglas was recommended for prosecution. The only person to be benefited was George Prince of Wales, who desired to be divorced from his wife, and it is alleged that he suborned these witnesses to commit perjury against her. At this time the Prince of Wales himself had just added Lady Hertford to an almost interminable muster-roll, and was mixed up in a still more strange and disgraceful transaction, in which he used his personal influence to canvass Peers—sitting as the highest law court in the realm—in order to induce them to vote the guardianship of Miss Seymour, a niece of Lady Hertford, to Mrs. Fitzherbert. Spencer Percival, who acted for the Princess of Wales, being about to publish the whole of the proceedings of the Royal Commissioners with the evidence and their verdict, his book was quietly suppressed, and he received a reward—a post in the Cabinet. It is said that George III directed the report of the Commissioners to be destroyed, and every trace of the whole affair to be buried in oblivion.

For some years rumors had been current of corruption in the administration of military promotion under the Duke of York, just as for some time past rumors have been current of abuse of patronage under his Royal Highness the present Duke of Cambridge. A Major Hogan, in 1808, published a declaration that he had lost his promotion because he had refused to give the sum of £600 to the Duke of York's "Venus".

On the 27th January, 1809, Colonel Wardle—who is said to have been prompted to the course by his Royal Highness the Duke of Kent—rose in his place in the House of Commons, and formally charged his Royal Highness Frederick Duke of York with corruption in the administration of army patronage.

It is difficult to determine how far credit should be given to the statements of Mrs. Clarke, who positively alleges that she was bribed to betray the Duke of York by his brother, the Duke of Kent, the father of her present Majesty. It is quite certain that Major Dodd, the then secretary of the Duke of Kent, was most active in collecting and marshalling the evidence in support of the various charges made in the Commons against the Duke of York. The Duke of Kent, however, after the whole business was over, formally and officially denied that he was directly or indirectly mixed up with the business. It is clear that much bitter feeling had for some time existed between the Dukes of York and Kent. In a pamphlet published about that time, we find the following remarkable passages relating to the Duke of Kent's removal from his military command at Gibraltar:—"It is, however, certain that the creatures whom we could name, and who are most in his [the Duke of York's] confidence, were, to a man, instructed and industriously employed in traducing the character and well-merited fame of the Duke of Kent, by misrepresenting his conduct with all the baseness of well-trained sycophants. Moreover, we need not hesitate in saying that this efficient Commander-in-Chief, contrary to the real sentiments of his Majesty, made use of his truly dangerous and undue influence with the confidential servants of the Crown to get his brother recalled from the Government of Gibraltar, under a disingenuous pretext, and at the risk of promoting sedition in the army."

In another pamphlet, dated 1808, apparently printed on behalf of the Duke of Kent, we find it suggested that the Duke of York had used Sir Hew Dalrymple as a spy on his brother, the Duke of Kent, at Gibraltar. Whether the Duke of York slandered the Duke of Kent, and whether the Queen's father revenged himself by getting up the case for Colonel Wardle, others must decide. The following is from Colonel Wardle's speech in the House of Commons: "In the year 1803, his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief took a handsome house, set up a full retinue of servants and horses, and also a lady of the name of Clarke. Captain Tonyn, of the 48th Regiment, was introduced by Captain Sandon, of the Royal Waggon Train, to this Mrs. Clarke, and it was agreed that, upon his being promoted to the majority of the 31st Regiment, he should pay her £500. The £500 lodged with Mr. Donovan by Captain Sandon was paid by him to Mrs. Clarke. The difference between a company and a majority is £1,100; this lady received only £500, while the half-pay fund lost the whole sum, for the purpose of putting £500 into the pocket of Mrs. Clarke. This £500 was paid by Mrs. Clarke to Mr. Perkins, a silversmith, in part payment for a service of plate; that the Commander-in-Chief made good the remainder, and that the goods were sent to his house in Gloucester Place. From this I infer, first, that Mrs. Clarke possesses the power of military promotion; secondly, that she received a pecuniary consideration for such promotion; and, thirdly, that the Commander-in-Chief was a partaker in the benefit arising from such transactions. In this case, there are no less than five different persons as witnesses—viz., Major Tonyn, Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Donovan, Captain Sandon, and the executor of Mr. Perkins, the silversmith. The next instance is of Lieut. Colebrooke, of the 56th Regiment. It was agreed that Mrs. Clarke should receive £200 upon Lieut. Colebrooke's name appearing in the *Gazette* for promotion. At that moment this lady was anxious to go on an excursion into the country, and she stated to His Royal Highness that she had an opportunity of getting £200 to defray the expenses of it without applying to him. This was stated upon a Thursday, and on the Saturday following

this officer's name appeared in the *Gazette*, and he was accordingly promoted; upon which Mr. Tuck waited on the lady and paid her the money. To this transaction the witnesses are Lieut. Colebrooke, Mr. Tuck, and Mrs. Clarke."

After instancing further cases, Colonel Wardle stated that: "At this very hour there is a public office in the City where commissions are still offered at the reduced prices which Mrs. Clarke chooses to exact for them. The agents there have declared to me that they are now employed by the present favorite, Mrs. Carey. They have not only declared this as relative to military commissions, but they have carried it much further; for, in addition to commissions in the army, places of all descriptions, both in Church and State, are transacted at their office, and these agents do not hesitate to give it under their own hands that they are employed by many of the first officers in his Majesty's service."

On the examination of witnesses, and general inquiry, which lasted seven weeks, the evidence was overwhelming; but the Duke of York, having written a letter pledging his honor as a Prince that he was innocent, was acquitted, although at least 112 members of Parliament voted for a verdict of condemnation. Lord Temple said that "he found the Duke of York deeply criminal in allowing this woman to interfere in his official duties. The evidence brought forward by accident furnished convincing proof of his crime. It was evident in French's levy. It was evident in the case of Dr. O'Meara, this minister of purity, this mirror of virtue, who, professing a call from God, could so far debase himself, so far abuse his sacred vocation, as to solicit a recommendation from such a person as Mrs. Clarke, by which, with an eye to a bishopric, he obtained an opportunity of preaching before the King. What could be said in justification of his Royal Highness for allowing this hypocrite to come down to Weymouth under a patronage unbecoming his duty, rank, and situation?"

Mr. Tierney said: "It was easy to conceive that his Royal Highness would have been prompt to declare his innocence upon a vital point; but why declare it upon the 'honor of a Prince', for the thing had no meaning?"

Mr. Lyttleton declared that "if it were in the power of the House to send down to posterity the character of the Duke of York unsullied—if their proceedings did not extend beyond their journals, he should be almost inclined to concur in the vote of acquittal, even in opposition to his sense of duty. But though the House should acquit his Royal Highness, the proofs would still remain, and the public opinion would be guided by them, and not by the decision of the House. It was in the power of the House to save its own character, but not that of the Commander-in-Chief."

It is alleged that the Queen herself by no means stood with clean hands: that in connexion with Lady Jersey and a Doctor Randolph, her Majesty realised an enormous sum by the sale of cadetships for the East Indies.

On the 31st of May, 1810, London was startled by the narrative of a terrible tragedy. His Royal Highness Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, afterwards King of Hanover, and who, while King of Hanover, drew £24,000 a year from the pockets of English taxpayers, was wounded in his own room in the dead of the night by some man whom he did not see, although the room was lighted by a lamp, although his Royal Highness saw "a letter" which lay on a night table, and which letter was "covered with blood". The wounds are said to have been sword wounds inflicted with an attempt to assassinate, by Joseph Sellis, a valet of the Duke, who is also said to have immediately afterwards committed suicide by cutting his own throat. General Sir B. Stephenson, who saw the body of Sellis, but who was not examined at the inquest, swore that "the head was nearly severed from the body". Sellis's cravat had been cut through and taken off his neck. Sir Everard Home and Sir Henry Hallford were the physicians present at St. James's Palace the day of this tragedy, and two surgeons were present at the inquest, but no medical or surgical evidence was taken as to whether or not the death of Sellis was the result of suicide or murder; but a cheesemonger was called to prove that twelve years before he had heard Sellis say: "Damn the King and the Royal Family!"; and a maid-servant was called to prove that fourteen years before Sellis had said:

"Damn the Almighty!". Despite this conclusive evidence, many horrible rumors were current which at the time were left uncontradicted; but on the 17th April, 1832, his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland made an affidavit in which he swore that he had not murdered Sellis himself, and that "in case the said person named Sellis did not die by his own hands", then that he, the Duke, "was not in any way, in any manner, privy or accessory to his death". His Royal Highness also swore that "he never did commit, nor had any intention of committing, the detestable crime" which it had been pretended Sellis had discovered the Duke in the act of committing. This of course entirely clears the Queen's uncle from all suspicion. Daniel O'Connell, indeed, described him as "the mighty great liar", but with the general character for truthfulness of the family, it would be in the highest degree improper to suggest even the semblance of a doubt. It was proved upon the inquest that Sellis was a sober, quiet man, in the habit of daily shaving the Duke, and that he had never exhibited any suicidal or homicidal tendencies. It therefore appears that he tried to wound or kill his Royal Highness without any motive, and under circumstances in which he knew discovery was inevitable, and that he then killed himself with a razor, cutting his head almost off his body, severing it to the bone. When Matthew Henry Graslin first saw the body, he "told them all that Sellis had been murdered", and although he was called on the inquest, he does not say one word as to the condition of Sellis's body, or as to whether or not he believes it to have been a suicide. Of all the persons who saw the body of Sellis, and they appear to be many, only one, a sergeant in the Coldstreams, gave the slightest evidence as to the state in which the body was found, and no description whatever was given on the inquest of the nature of the fearful wound which had nearly severed Sellis's head from his body; nor, although it was afterwards proved by sworn evidence that Sellis's cravat "was cut through the whole of the folds, and the inside fold was tinged with blood", was any evidence offered as to this on the inquest, although it shows that Sellis must have first tried to cut his throat through his cravat,

and that having partially but ineffectively cut his throat, he then took off his cravat and gave himself with tremendous force the gash which caused his death. It is said that the razor with which Sellis killed himself was found two feet from the bed, and on the left-hand side; but although it was stated that Sellis was a left-handed man, no evidence was offered of this; and on the contrary, the bloody hand marks, said to have been made by Sellis on the doors, were all on the right-hand. It is a great nuisance when people you are mixed up with commit suicide. Undoubtedly, Sellis must have killed himself. The journals tell us how Lord Graves killed himself long years afterward. The Duke of Cumberland and Lady Graves, the widow, rode out together very shortly after the suicide.

In the Rev. Erskine Neale's "Life of the Duke of Kent" it is stated that a surgeon of note, who saw Sellis after his death, declared that there were several wounds on the back of the neck which it was physically impossible could have been self-inflicted. To his pupils the surgeon repeated this in strong language; declaring that "no man can behead himself".

The madness of George III having become too violent and too continual to permit it to be any longer hidden from the people, the Prince of Wales was, in 1811, declared Regent, with limited powers, and £70,000 a year additional were voted for the Regent's expenses, and a further £10,000 a year also granted to the Queen as custodian of her husband. The grant to the Queen was the more outrageous, as her great wealth and miserly conduct were well known. When the Regent was first appointed, he authorised the Chancellor of the Exchequer to declare officially, that he would not add to the burdens of the nation; and yet, in 1812, the allowance voted was made retrospective, so as to include every hour of his office.

In the discussion in Parliament on the proposed Regency, it appeared that the people had been for a considerable period utterly deceived on the subject of the King's illness; and that although his Majesty had been for some time blind, deaf and delirious, the Ministry, representing the King to be competent, had dared to carry on the Government whilst George III was in every sense incapacitated. It is worthy of notice that the

Right Honorable Benjamin Disraeli, the leader of the great Conservative party in this country, publicly declared on September 26th, 1871, that her present Majesty, Queen Victoria, was both "physically and morally" incapable of performing her regal functions. One advantage of having the telegraph wires in the hands of Government is shown by the fact that all the telegraphic summaries omitted the most momentous words of Mr. Disraeli's speech. Benjamin Disraeli has since accepted a peerage from the lady he thus described as morally incapable. During the debate in the session 1811 it was shown that when the King was mad in the month of March, 1804, he had on the 4th been represented by Lord Eldon, as if he had given his assent to a Bill granting certain lands to the Duke of York, and on the 9th as if he had signed a commission. Earl Grey stated that it was notorious that on two occasions the Great Seal had been employed as if by his Majesty's command, while he was insane. The noble earl also declared that in 1801 the King was mad for some weeks, and yet during that time councils were held, members sworn, and acts done requiring the King's sanction. Sir Francis Burdett said: "that to have a person at the head of affairs who had long been incapable of signing his name to a document without some one to guide his hand; a person long incapable of receiving petitions, of even holding a levée, or discharging the most ordinary functions of his office, and now afflicted with this mental malady, was a most mischievous example to the people of this country, while it had a tendency to expose the Government to the contempt of foreign nations".

One of the earliest acts of the Prince Regent was to re-appoint his brother, the Duke of York, to the office of Commander-in-Chief. A motion was made by Lord Milton, in the House of Commons, declaring this appointment to be "highly improper and indecorous". The Ministry were, however, sufficiently powerful to negative this resolution by a large majority. Though his Royal Highness had resigned his high office when assailed with charges of the grossest corruption, he was permitted to resume his command of the army without even a protest, save from a minority of the

House of Commons, and from a few of the unrepresented masses. The chief mistress of the Prince Regent at this time was the Marchioness of Hertford; and the *Courier*, then the Ministerial journal, had the cool impudence to speak of her as "Britain's guardian angel", because her influence had been used to hinder the carrying of any measure for the relief of the Irish Catholics. Amongst the early measures under the Regency was the issue, in Ireland, of a circular letter addressed to the Sheriffs and Lord Lieutenants of the counties, forbidding the meetings of Catholics, and threatening all Catholic committees with arrest and imprisonment. This, however, was so grossly illegal that it had shortly after to be abandoned, a Protestant jury having refused to convict the first prisoners brought to trial. It is curious to read the arguments against Catholic Emancipation pleaded in the *Courier*, one being that during the whole of his reign, George III "is known to have felt the most conscientious and irrevocable objection" to any such measure of justice to his unfortunate Irish subjects.

In 1812, we had much poverty in England; and although this was not dealt with by Parliament, £100,000 were granted to Lord Wellington, and £200,000 voted for Russian sufferers by the French War. We had a few months previously voted £100,000 for the relief of the Portuguese against the French. On a message from the Prince Regent, annuities of £9,000 each were also granted to the four Princesses, exclusive of £4,000 from the Civil List. The message from the Prince Regent for the relief of the "Russian sufferers" was brought down on the 17th of December; and it is a curious fact that, while Lord Castlereagh and Lord Liverpool were eulogising the Russians for their "heroic patriotism" in burning Moscow, the Russians themselves were declaring in the *St. Petersburg Gazette* that the deed was actually committed by "the impious French", on whose heads the *Gazette* invoked the vengeance of God.

In 1812 the Prince Regent gave a sinecure office, that of Paymaster of Widows' Pensions, to his "confidential servant", Colonel Macmahon. The nature of the private services which

had been for some years performed by this gallant colonel for this virtuous Prince may be better guessed than described. Mr. Henry Brougham declared the appointment to be an insult to Parliament; and, in obedience to the voice of popular opinion, the Commons voted the immediate abolition of the office. To recompense Colonel Macmahon for the loss of his place, he was immediately appointed keeper of the Privy Purse and Private Secretary to the Prince Regent. This appointment was also severely criticised; and, although the Government was sufficiently powerful to defeat the attack in the Commons, they were yet compelled, by the strong protest made by the public against such an improper appointment, to nominally transfer the salary to the Regent's privy purse. The transfer was not real, as, the Civil List being always in debt, the nation had ultimately to pay the money.

In 1813 foreign subsidies to the amount of £11,000,000, and 100,000 stands of arms were voted by the English Parliament. Out of the above Portugal received £2,000,000, Sicily £400,000, Spain £2,000,000, Sweden £1,000,000, Russia and Prussia £3,000,000, Austria £1,000,000, besides stores sent to Germany to the amount of £2,000,000 more.

This year his Royal Highness the Prince Regent went to Ascot races, where he was publicly damned for a betting debt incurred some years before, and left unpaid.

Great excitement was created in and out of Parliament by the complaint of the Princess of Wales that she was not allowed to see her daughter, the Princess Charlotte. The Prince Regent formally declared through the Speaker of the House of Commons, that he would not meet, on any occasion, public or private, the Princess of Wales (whom it was urged that "he had been forced to marry"): while the Princess of Wales wrote a formal letter to Parliament complaining that her character had been "traded by suborned perjury". Princess Charlotte refused to be presented at Court except by her mother, who was not allowed to go there. In the House of Commons, Mr. Whitbread challenged the Lords Commissioners with unduly straining the evidence by

leading questions; and Lord Ellenborough, in his place in the House of Peers, declared that the accusation was "as false as hell". Ultimately it was admitted that the grave charges against the Princess of Wales were groundless, and £35,000 a year were voted to her, she agreeing to travel abroad. Mr. Bathurst, a sinecurist pensioner, pleading on behalf of the Prince Regent that the House of Commons ought not to interfere, urged that it was no unusual thing to have dissensions in the Royal Family, and that they had been frequent in the reigns of George I and George II. Mr. Stuart Wortley, in the course of a severe speech in reply to Lord Castlereagh, declared that "we had a Royal Family which took no warning from what was said or thought about them, and seemed to be the only persons in the country who were wholly regardless of their own welfare and respectability".

The Princess Charlotte of Wales was at this time residing in Warwick House, and some curiosity was aroused by the dismissal, by order of the Prince Regent, of all the servants. This was immediately followed by the flight of the Princess from the custody of her father to the residence of her mother, the Princess of Wales. Persuaded to return to the Prince Regent by her mother, Lord Eldon, and others, she appears to have been really detained as a sort of prisoner, for we find the Duke of Sussex soon after complaining in the House of Lords that he was unable to obtain access to the Princess, and asking by whose authority she was kept in durance. Happy family, these Brunswicks!

In 1814, £100,000 further were voted to the Duke of Wellington, together with an annuity of £10,000 a year to be at any time commuted for £300,000. The income of the Duke of Wellington from places, pensions, and grants, amounted to an enormous sum. At present we pay his heir £4,000 a year for having inherited his father's riches. During the year 1814, £218,857 were voted for the payment of the Civil List debts.

On the 12th of August, 1814, the Princess of Wales quitted England, and it is alleged that on the evening prior to her departure the Prince Regent, having, as usual, drunk much wine, proposed a toast, "To the Princess of Wales's damnation,

and may she never return to England". Whether this story, which Dr. Doran repeats, be true or false, it is certain that the Prince Regent hated his wife with a thoroughly merciless hatred. When the death of Napoleon was known in England, a gentleman, thinking to gain favor with George IV, said: "Your Majesty's bitterest enemy is dead". The "first gentleman of Europe" thought only of his wife, and replied, "Is she, by God!"

The highly esteemed and virtuous Duke of Cumberland was married at Berlin, to the Princess of Salms, a widow who had been twice married, once betrothed, and once divorced. The lady was niece to the Queen of England, who refused to receive her publicly or privately. On this refusal being known, a letter was published, written and signed by the Queen herself, to her brother, the Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, the father of the bride, in which letter the Queen gave assurance of a kind reception to the bride on her arrival in England. The Queen's friends replied that the Queen's letter was only written to be shown to the German Courts on the condition that the Duchess should not come to England. Curious notions of truth and honor seem current among these Brunswicks!

On the 27th of June the Lords, on a message from the Prince Regent, voted an additional allowance of £6,000 a-year to the Duke of Cumberland in consequence of the marriage. In the House of Commons, after a series of very warm debates, in which Lord Castlereagh objected to answer "any interrogatories tending to vilify the Royal Family", the House ultimately refused to grant the allowance by 126 votes against 125.

One historian says: "The demeanor of the Duchess of Cumberland in this country has been, to say the least, unobtrusive and unimpeached; but it must be confessed that a disastrous fatality—something inauspicious and indescribable—attaches to the Prince, her husband."

This year, £200,000 further were voted to the Duke of Wellington, for the purchase of an estate, although it appeared from one Member of Parliament's speech that the vote should rather have been to the Prince Regent. "Who," he asked, "had rendered the army efficient? The Prince Regent—by

restoring the Duke of York to the Horse Guards. Who had gained the battle of Waterloo? The Prince Regent—by giving the command of the army to the Duke of Wellington"! The Prince Regent himself had even stronger opinion on the matter. Thackeray says: "I believe it is certain about George IV that he had heard so much of the war, knighted so many people, and worn such a prodigious quantity of marshal's uniforms, cocked hats, cocks' feathers, scarlet and bullion in general, that he actually fancied he had been present at some campaigns, and under the name of General Brock led a tremendous charge of the German legion at Waterloo".

In 1816, Prince Leopold of Coburg Saalfeld, a very petty German Prince without estate or position, married the Princess Charlotte of Wales, as if he were a Protestant, although he most certainly, on other occasions, acted as if he belonged to the Catholic Church. A grant of £60,000 a year was made to the Royal couple; £60,000 was given for the wedding outfit, and £50,000 secured to Prince Leopold for life, in the event of his surviving the Princess. And although this was done, it was well known to the Prince Regent and the members of the Government, that on the 2nd of January of the previous year, a marriage ceremony, according to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church, had been performed, by which the Prince Leopold was united to the Countess of Cohaky. Bigamy appears to be a fashionable vice, and one to which these Brunswicks never raise any objection.

In this year £185,000 were voted for the King's debts.

On the 9th December the City of London presented an address to the Prince Regent, in which they complained of "immense subsidies to foreign powers to defend their own territories, or to commit aggressions on those of their neighbours," "of an unconstitutional and unprecedented military force in time of peace, of the unexampled and increasing magnitude of the Civil List, of the enormous sums paid for unmerited pensions and sinecures, and of a long course of the most lavish and improvident expenditure of the public money throughout every branch of the Government". This address appears to have deeply wounded the Regent, and the expression of stern rebuke he used in

replying was coupled with a rude sulkiness of manner. He emphasised his answer with pauses and frowns, and turned on his heel as soon as he had delivered it. And yet at this moment hundreds of thousands in England were starving. Kind monarchs, these Brunswicks!

Early in 1817 the general distress experienced in all parts of England, and which had been for some time on the increase, was of a most severe character. Meetings in London and the provinces grew frequent, and were most numerous attended; and on February 3rd, in consequence of a message from the Prince Regent, Committees of Secrecy were appointed by the Lords and Commons to inquire into the character of the various movements. The Government was weak and corrupt, but the people lacked large-minded leaders, and the widespread discontent of the masses of the population rendered some of their numbers easy victims to the police spies who manufactured political plots.

On the 31st March, 1817, an Act was passed by which certain societies or clubs, calling themselves Spenceans, or Spencean Philanthropists, holding and professing for their object the confiscation and division of the land, and the extinction of the funded property of the Kingdom, were declared to be utterly suppressed and prohibited.

On the 6th of November, 1817, Princess Charlotte of Wales died. Complaints were raised that the Princess had not been fairly treated, and some excitement was created by the fact that Sir Richard Croft, the doctor who attended her, soon after committed suicide, and that the public and the reporters were not allowed to be present at the inquest. No notice whatever of the Princess's death was forwarded to her mother, the Princess of Wales. In a letter to the Duke of Buckingham, Mr. Wynn speaks of this as "the most brutal omission I ever remember, and one which would attach disgrace in private life". At this very time a large sum of money was being wasted in the employment of persons to watch the Princess of Wales on her foreign travels. In her correspondence we find the Princess complaining that her letters were opened and read, and that she was surrounded with spies, and Lord Liverpool

was compelled to admit that these were paid by the English Government. From the moment that George III was declared incurable and his death approaching, there seems little doubt that desperate means were resorted to to manufacture evidence against the Princess to warrant a divorce.

On July 13th, 1818, his Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence married Adelaide, Princess of Saxe Meiningen, and his Royal Highness the Duke of Kent married her Serene Highness Victoria, Princess of Leiningen. The Duke of Clarence, of course, had voted to him an additional allowance of £6,000 a year on entering the married state, although he was already receiving from the country more than £21,000 a year in cash, and a house rent free. It is highly edifying to read the debates in Parliament, when some objection was raised to the extra sums proposed to be voted to one of the Royal Dukes; Mr. Canning pleaded as a reason for the payment, that his Royal Highness was not marrying "for his own private gratification, but because he had been advised to do so for the political purposes of providing succession to the throne". Pleasant this for the lady, and glorious for the country—Royal breeding machines! The Duke of Kent, who had the same additional vote, had about £25,000 a year, besides a grant of £20,000 towards the payment of his debts, and a loan of £6,000 advanced in 1806, of which up to the time of his marriage only £1,000 had been repaid.

Of Edward Augustus Duke of Kent, father of her present Majesty, it is only necessary to say a few words. The fourth son of George III was somewhat better than his brothers, and perhaps for this very reason he seems always to have been disliked and kept at a distance by his father, mother, and brothers. Nor was the Duke of Kent less disliked amongst the Army, which he afterwards commanded. Very few of the officers loved him, and the bulk of the privates seem to have regarded him with the most hostile feelings. Kept very short of money by his miserly father and mother, he had even before his majority incurred considerable debts; and coming to England in 1790, in order to try to induce the King to make him some sufficient allowance, he was ordered to quit England

in ten days. While allowances were made to all the other sons of George, the Duke of Kent had no Parliamentary vote until he was thirty-three years of age. In 1802 he was appointed Governor of Gibraltar, where a mutiny took place, and the Duke had a narrow escape with his life. The Duke of Kent's friends allege that this mutiny was encouraged by officers of the highest rank, secretly sustained by the Duke of York. The Duke of York's friends, on the contrary, maintain that the overbearing conduct of the Duke of Kent, his severity in details, and general harshness in command, alone produced the result. The Duke of Kent was recalled from the government of Gibraltar, and for some months the pamphleteers were busy on behalf of the two Dukes, each seeking to prove that the Royal brother of his Royal client was a dishonorable man. Pleasant people, these Brunswicks! If either side wrote the truth, one of the Dukes was a rascal. If neither side wrote the truth, both were. The following extract from a pamphlet by Mary Ann Clarke, mistress of the Duke of York, will serve to show the nature of the publications I refer to: "I believe there is scarcely a military man in the Kingdom who was at Gibraltar during the Duke of Kent's command of that fortress but is satisfied that the Duke of York's refusal of a court-martial to his Royal brother *afforded an incontestible proof* of his *regard* for the *military* character and honor of the Duke of Kent; for if a court-martial had been granted to the Governor of Gibraltar I always understood there was but *one* opinion as to what would have been the *result*; and *then* the Duke of Kent would have lost several thousands a year, and incurred such public reflections that would, most probably, have been painful to his *honorable* and *acute* feelings. It was, however, this *act of affection* for the Duke of Kent that laid the foundation of that *hatred* which has followed the Commander-in-Chief up to the present moment; and to this *unnatural feeling* he is solely indebted for all the misfortunes and disgrace to which he has been introduced. In one of the many conversations which I had with Majors Dodd and Glennie, upon the meditated ruin of the Duke of York, they informed me that their Royal friend had made every endeavor in his power to *poison*

the *King's ear* against the Commander-in-Chief; but as Colonel Taylor was so much about the person of his Majesty, all his efforts had proved ineffectual: and to have *spoken his sentiments* before Colonel Taylor would have been very injudicious, as he would immediately have communicated them to the Commander-in-Chief, who, though he knew this time (said these *confidential* and *worthy* patriots) that the Duke of Kent was *supporting* persons to *write* against *him*, and that some Parliamentary proceedings were upon the eve of bursting upon the public attention, yet deported himself towards his Royal brother as if they lived but for each other's honor and happiness; and the Duke of Kent, to *keep up appearances*, was more particular in his attention to the Duke of York than he had ever been before."

Despite the Duke of Kent's recall, he continued to receive salary and allowances as Governor of Gibraltar. After the celebration of the marriage, he resided abroad, and was on such unfriendly terms with his family that when he returned from Amorbach to England it was against the express orders of the Prince Regent, who, shortly after, meeting his brother at the Spanish Ambassador's, took not the slightest notice of him.

On the 17th November, 1818, the Queen died, and the custody of the body of the mad, deaf, and blind monarch of England, was nominally transferred to the Duke of York, who was voted an extra £10,000 a year for performing the duty of visiting his Royal father twice a week. Objection was ineffectually raised that his Royal Highness had also his income as Commander-in-Chief and General Officer, and it might have also been added, his pensions and his income as Prince Bishop of Osnaburg. Mr. Curwen said: "Considering how complete the revenue of his Royal Highness was from public emoluments, he could not consent to grant him one shilling upon the present occasion".

In 1819, the Duke of Kent tried to get up a lottery for the sale of his Castlebar estate, in order to pay his debts, which were then about £70,000; but the project, being opposed by the Prince Regent, fell to the ground.

On the 24th of May, 1819, her present Majesty was born; and on the 23rd January, 1820, the Duke of Kent, her father, died.

It was in August of this year that the "Peterloo" outrage took place. A meeting convened by Henry Hunt, in St. Peter's Fields, Manchester, was dispersed by force, six persons being killed and many being seriously wounded. Later in the year, Lord Liverpool carried the infamous "six Acts" intended to prevent the circulation of cheap literature as well as to crush out the right of meeting.

On the 29th January, 1820, after a sixty years' reign—in which debt, dishonor, and disgrace accrued to the nation he reigned over—George III died. The National Debt at the date of his accession to the throne was about £150,000,000, at his death it was about £900,000,000.

Phillimore asks: "Had it not been for the unlimited power of borrowing, how many unjust and capricious wars would have been avoided! How different would be our condition, and the condition of our posterity! If half the sum lavished to prevent anyone bearing the name of Napoleon from residing in France, for replacing the Bourbons on the thrones of France and Naples, for giving Belgium to Holland, Norway to Sweden, Finland to Russia, Venice and Lombardy to Austria, had been employed by individual enterprise, what would now be the resources of England?"

An extract, giving Lord Brougham's summary of George III's life and character, may, we think, fairly serve to close this chapter:—"Of a narrow understanding, which no culture had enlarged; of an obstinate disposition, which no education perhaps could have humanised; of strong feeling in ordinary things, and a resolute attachment to all his own opinions and predilections, George III possessed much of the firmness of purpose which being exhibited by men of contracted mind without any discrimination, and as pertinaciously when they are in the wrong as when they are in the right, lends to their characters an appearance of inflexible consistency, which is often mistaken for greatness of mind, and not seldom received as a substitute for honesty. In all that related to his kingly office he was the slave of deep-rooted selfishness; and no feeling of a kindly nature ever was allowed access to his bosom whenever his power was concerned."

CHAPTER V.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE IV.

The wretched reign of George IV commenced on the 30th January, 1820. Mr. Buckle speaks of "the incredible baseness of that ignoble voluptuary who succeeded George III on the throne". The coronation was delayed for a considerable period, partly in consequence of the hostility between the King and his unfortunate wife, and partly because of the cost. We find the Right Hon. Thomas Grenville writing of the coronation: "I think it probable that it will be put off, because the King will not like it unless it be expensive, and Vansittart knows not how to pay for it if it is". Generous monarchs, these Brunswicks! Thousands at that moment were in a state of starvation in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Lord Cassilis writes: "There seems nothing but chaos and desolation whatever way a man may turn himself . . . the lower orders existing only from the circumstance of the produce of the land being unmarketable. . . . The weavers are certainly employed, but they cannot earn more than from six to eight shillings a week. Such is our state." When the coronation did ultimately take place, some strange expenses crept in. Diamonds were charged for to the extent, it is said, of £80,000, which found their way to one of the King's favored mistresses. The crown itself was made up with hired jewels, which were kept for twenty-one months after the coronation, and for the hire of which alone the country had to pay £11,000. The charge for coronation robes was £24,000. It was in consequence of Sir Benjamin Bloomfield having to account for some of the diamonds purchased that he resigned his position in the King's household. Rather than be suspected of dishonesty, he preferred revealing that they had reached the hands of Lady Conyngham. Sir George Naylor, in an infamously servile publication, for which book alone the country

paid £3,000, describes "the superb habiliments which His Majesty—not less regardful of the prosperity of the people than of the splendor of his throne—was pleased to enjoin, should be worn upon the occasion of His Majesty's sacred coronation".

Sir William Knighton declares that on the news of the King's death reaching the Prince Regent, "the fatal tidings were received with a burst of grief that was very affecting". The King had been mad, and blind, and deaf for ten years, and the Queen, years before, had complained of the Prince's conduct as unfilial, if not inhuman. With the Prince Regent's known character, this sudden burst of grief is really "very affecting".

On the 23rd of February, London was startled with the news of what since has been described as the Cato Street Conspiracy. The trial of Arthur Thistlewood and his misguided associates is valuable for one lesson. The man who found money for the secret conspirators, and who incited them to treason and murder, was one George Edwards. This Edwards was well described by one of the journals of the period "as neither more nor less than the confidential agent of the original conspirators, to hire for them the treasons they have a purpose in detecting". By original conspirators were meant Lord Castlereagh and Lord Sidmouth. In the House of Commons, Mr. Alderman Wood moved formally: "That George Edwards be brought to the bar of the House on a breach of privilege. He pledged himself, if he had that incendiary in his hands, to convict him of the crimes imputed; he hoped he had not been suffered to escape beyond seas; otherwise there were hon. gentlemen who were in possession of him, so that he might be produced"—meaning by this that he was kept out of the way by the Government. "He regarded him as the sole author and contriver of the Cato Street plot. It was strange how such a man should be going about from public-house to public-house—nay, from one private house to another, boldly and openly instigating to such plots; and, in the midst of this, should become, from abject poverty, suddenly flush with money, providing arms, and supplying all conspirators." Mr. Hume seconded the motion. "It appeared by the depositions, not of one person only, but of a great many

persons, that the individual in question had gone about from house to house with hand-grenades, and, up to twenty-four hours only preceding the 23rd of February, had been unceasingly urging persons to join with him in the atrocious plot to assassinate his Majesty's Ministers. All of a sudden he became quite rich, and was buying arms in every quarter, at every price, and of every description; still urging a variety of persons to unite with him. Now, it was very fitting for the interest of the country that the country should know who the individuals were who supplied him with the money."

As a fair specimen of the disposition of the King in dealing with his Ministry, I give the following extract from a memorandum of Lord Chancellor Eldon, dated April 20th, 1820: "Our royal master seems to have got into a temper again, so far as I could judge from his conversation with me this morning. He has been pretty well disposed to part with us all, because we would not make additions to his revenue. This we thought conscientiously we could not do in the present state of the country, and of the distresses of the middle and lower orders of the people—to which we might add, too, that of the higher orders. My own individual opinion was such that I could not bring myself to oppress the country at present by additional taxation for that purpose."

On the 23rd of March, Henry Hunt, John Knight, Joseph Johnson, Joseph Healey, and Samuel Bamford, were, after six days' trial at York, found guilty of unlawfully assembling. Lord Grenville feared that, if acquitted, Peterloo might form a terrible bill of indictment against the Ministry. His lordship writes on March 29th to the Marquis of Buckingham: "It would have been a dreadful thing if it had been established by the result of that trial that the Manchester meeting was under all its circumstances a legal assembly". His lordship knew that the magistrates and yeomanry cavalry might have been indicted for murder had the meeting been declared legal. Sir C. Wolseley and the Rev. J. Harrison were at this time being prosecuted for seditious speaking, and were ultimately found guilty on April 10th. In May, the state of the country was terrible; even Baring, the Conservative banker, on May 7th,

described the "state of England" to a full House of Commons "in the most lamentable terms". On the 8th, we find Mr. W. H. Fremantle saying of the King: "His language is only about the Coronation and Lady Conyngham [his then favorite Sultana]; very little of the state of the country". Early in June, it being known that Queen Caroline was about to return to England, and that she intended to be present at the Coronation, the King offered her £50,000 a year for life to remain on the Continent, and forbear from claiming the title of Queen of England. This Caroline indignantly refused. The Queen's name had, by an order in Council, and on the King's direction, been omitted from the Liturgy as that of a person unfit to be prayed for, and on the 6th July a Bill of pains and penalties was introduced by Lord Liverpool, alleging adultery between the Queen and one Bartolomeo Bergami. To wade through the mass of disgusting evidence offered by the advisers of the King in support of the Bill is terrible work. It seems clear that many of the witnesses committed perjury. It is certain that the diplomatic force of England was used to prevent the Queen from obtaining witnesses on her behalf. Large sums of the taxpayers' money were shown to have been spent in surrounding the Princess of Wales with spies in Italy and Switzerland. Naturally, the people took sides with the Queen. To use the language of William Cobbett: "The joy of the people of all ranks, except nobility, clergy, and the army and the navy, who in fact were theirs, was boundless; and they expressed it in every possible way that people can express their joy. They had heard rumors about a lewd life, and about an adulterous intercourse. They could not but believe that there was some foundation for something of this kind; but they, in their justice, went back to the time when she was in fact turned out of her husband's house with a child in her arms, without blame of any sort ever having been imputed to her. They compared what they had *heard* of the wife with what they had *seen* of the husband, and they came to their determination accordingly. As far as related to the question of guilt or innocence they cared not a straw; they took a large view of the matter; they went over her whole

history ; they determined that she had been wronged, and they resolved to uphold her."

On the 6th of August, the Duchess of York died. Dr. Doran thus writes her epitaph : " Her married life had been unhappy, and every day of it was a disgrace to her profligate, unprincipled, and good-tempered husband".

In the month of September, Lord Castlereagh was compelled to admit that the expenses incurred in obtaining evidence from abroad against the Queen had been defrayed out of the Secret Service Money. The trial of Queen Caroline lasted from the 17th of August until the 10th of November, when, in a House of 207 peers, the Queen was found guilty by a majority of nine votes. On this, Lord Liverpool said that: "As the public sentiment had been expressed so decidedly against the measure," he would withdraw the Bill. Amongst those who voted against the Queen the names appear of Frederick Duke of York and William Henry Duke of Clarence. They had been most active in attacking the Queen, and now were shameless enough to vote as her judges. While the trial was proceeding, the Duke of York's private conversation "was violent against the Queen". He ought surely, for very shame's sake, this Prince Bishop, to have remembered the diamonds sent by the King, his father, to Princess Caroline Amelia Elizabeth of Brunswick. Being the bearer of the jewels, his Royal Highness the Duke of York and Prince Bishop of Osnaburgh stole them, and presented them to Mrs. Mary Anne Clarke. Mr. Denman, the Queen's Solicitor-General, was grandly audacious in his indictment of the King's brothers for their cowardly conduct. In the presence of the assembled Lords he, without actually referring to him by name, denounced the Duke of Clarence as a calumniator. He called on the Duke to come forward openly, saying: "Come forth, thou slanderer!" And this slanderer was afterwards our King! The Queen, in a protest against the Bill, declared that "those who avowed themselves her prosecutors have presumed to sit in judgment upon the question between the Queen and themselves. Peers have given their voices against her, who had heard the whole evidence for her charge, and absented them-

4

selves during her defence. Others have come to the discussion from the Secret Committee with minds biassed by a mass of slander, which her enemies have not dared to bring forward in the light." Lord Dacre, in presenting the protest to the assembled peers, added: "Her Majesty complained that the individuals who formed her prosecutors in this odious measure sat in judgment against her. My lords, I need not express an opinion upon this complaint; delicacy alone ought to have, in my opinion, prevented their becoming her accusers and also her judges."

George IV was guilty of the vindictive folly of stripping Brougham of his King's Counsel gown as a punishment for his brilliant defence of the Queen.

While the trial of the Queen was going on it might have been thought that the King would, at any rate, affect a decency of conduct. But these Brunswicks are shameless. Speaking of the cottage at Windsor, on August 11th, Mr. Fremantle says: "The principal object is, of course, the Lady Conyng-ham, who is here. The King and her always together, separated from the rest, they ride every day or go on the water, and in the evening sitting alone. . . . The excess of his attentions and *enjouement* is beyond all belief." On December 17th, Mr. Fremantle finds the King ill, and says: "The impression of my mind is that the complaint is in the head". Most of the Brunswicks have been affected in the head. Either George I was insane, or George II was not his son. George II himself had certainly one or two delusions, if not more. George III's sanity is not affirmed by anyone. It may be a question whether or not any allegation of hereditary affection is enough, however, to justify an appeal to Parliament for a re-arrangement of the succession to the Throne.

On the 9th of January, 1821, King George IV wrote to Lord Chancellor Eldon, in the "double capacity as a friend and as a minister", in order to influence the proceedings then pending in the law courts "against vendors of treason and libellers".

On the 8th of June, on the motion of Lord Londonderry, and after an ineffectual opposition by Mr. Hume, £6,000 a year additional were voted to the Duke of Clarence. The vote,

made retrospective, gave the Duke £18,000 extra in cash. Besides this, £9,166 was charged for fitting up the Duke's apartments.

On the 5th of July, Mr. Scarlett moved the Court on behalf of Olivia Wilmot Serres, claiming to be the legitimate daughter of the Duke of Cumberland, who was brother of George III. Mr. Scarlett submitted documents proving the accuracy of the statement, but on a technical point the matter was not gone into.

In August 1821, King George IV visited Ireland. Knowing his habits, and the outcome of other members of the family, it excites little surprise to read that, on the voyage to Dublin, "his Majesty partook most abundantly of goose pie and whisky", and landed in Ireland "in the last stage of intoxication". And this was a king! This journey cost the country £58,261. In a public speech by the King in Ireland within a few hours after receiving the news of Queen Caroline's death, the monarch said: "This is one of the happiest days of my life".

On the 7th of August Queen Caroline died. In Thelwall's *Champion* there is a full account of the disgraceful conduct of the King's Government with reference to the funeral. On the morning of the 14th, after a disgusting contest between her executors and the King's Government for the possession of her remains, they were removed from Brandenburgh House towards Harwich, on their way to interment at Brunswick. The ministers, to gratify personal feelings of unworthy rancor beyond the grave, gave orders that the funeral should take a circuit, to avoid manifestations of sympathy from the Corporation and the people along the direct route through London. At Kensington, the procession found every road but that of London barricaded by the people, and was constrained to take the forbidden route, with the intention of passing through Hyde Park into the northern road. The Park gate was closed and barricaded, but was forced by the military. The upper gate was also barricaded. Here a conflict took place between the military and the people, and two persons were shot by the soldiers. The procession moved on, the conflict

was renewed, the people triumphed, and the corpse was borne through the City. Sir Robert Wilson remonstrated with some soldiers and an officer on duty, but his humane interference caused his removal from the army. In return, a large sum was subscribed by the public to compensate Sir Robert Wilson for his loss. The directing civil magistrate present, for having consulted his humanity in preference to his orders, and for having, to prevent bloodshed, yielded to the wishes of the multitude, was also deprived of his commission. On the inquest on the body of one of the men shot, the coroner's jury, vindicating the rights of the people, returned a verdict of "Wilful murder" against the Life-Guardsman who fired.

While the King was in Ireland he paraded his connexion with the Marchioness of Conyngham in the most glaring manner. Fremantle says: "I never in my life heard of anything to equal the King's infatuation and conduct towards Lady Conyngham. She lived exclusively with him during the whole time he was in Ireland, at the Phoenix Park. When he went to Slane, she received him dressed out as for a drawing-room. He saluted her, and they then retired alone to her apartments."

If it be objected that I am making too great a feature of the Marchioness of Conyngham's connexion with the King, I plead my justification in Henry W. Wynn's declaration of "her folly and rapacity", affirming that this folly and rapacity have left their clear traces on the conduct of affairs, and in the increase of the national burdens. Her husband, as a reward for her virtue, was made an English peer in 1821. Lord Mount Charles, his eldest son, was made Master of the Robes, Groom of His Majesty's Bedchamber, and ultimately became a member of the Government. Of this Bulwer said: "He may prove himself an admirable statesman, but there is no reason to suppose it".

To fairly judge the account of the rapturous reception given to the King in Ireland, it is needful to add that political discontent was manifest on all sides. Poverty and misery prevailed in Limerick, Mayo, Cavan, and Tipperary, which

counties were proclaimed and occupied by a large military force. Executions, imprisonments, and tumults filled the pages of the daily journals.

In the autumn of 1821, King George IV visited Hanover, and the Duke of Buckingham states that "Lord Liverpool put a final stop to the visit by declaring that no more drafts could be honored, except for the direct return home".

On the 12th August, 1821, the Marquis of Londonderry sent himself to heaven, from North Cray Farm, Bexley, at the age of fifty-three. He was buried in Westminster Abbey. Meaner clay would have been got rid of at some cross roads.

"The death," says Wallace, "of a public man in England—especially a death so sudden and lamentable—greatly assuages the political resentments against him in his life; and there was a reaction in aristocratic circles in favor of Lord Londonderry when he ceased to live. His servile complaisance to despots abroad, his predilection for the worst engines of government at home, were for a moment forgotten. But the honest hatred of the populace, deep-rooted, sincere, and savage, remained untouched, and spoke in a fearful yell of triumphant execration over his remains whilst his coffin was descending into the grave in Westminster Abbey."

No language could do fitting justice to Robert Stewart, Marquis of Londonderry. Words would be too weak to describe Castlereagh's cruelty and baseness towards his own countrymen, or his conduct in connexion with the Government of England. All that can be fittingly said is, that he was pre-eminently suited to be Minister of State under a Brunswick.

In 1823, the thanks of Parliament were presented to George IV for "having munificently presented to the nation a library formed by George III". Unfortunately, the thanks were undeserved. George IV was discreditable enough to accept thanks for a donation he had never made. The truth is, says the *Daily News*, "that the King being, as was his wont, in urgent need of money, entertained a proposal to sell his father's library to the Emperor of Russia for a good round sum. The books were actually packed up, and the cases directed in due form, when representations were made to Lord Sidmouth, then Home

Secretary, on the subject. The minister resolved to hinder the iniquity from being perpetrated. Accordingly, he represented his view of the matter to the King. George IV graciously consented, after a good deal of solicitation, to present the library to the nation, conditionally on his receiving in return the same sum as he would have received had the sale of it to the Emperor of Russia been completed. What the nation did was, firstly, to pay the money; secondly, to erect a room for the library at the cost of £140,000; and, thirdly, to return fulsome thanks to the sovereign for his unparalleled munificence."

On the 24th of April, 1825, the Duke of York spoke in the House of Lords against Catholic Emancipation. His speech was made, if not by the direction, most certainly with the consent, of the King. George IV's reluctance to Catholic Emancipation was deep-rooted and violent. The bare mention of the subject exasperated him. He was known to say, and only in his milder mood: "I wish those Catholics were damned or emancipated!" The angered despotism of this alternative still afforded the hope that this intolerance might be overcome by his selfish love of ease. The Duke of York's address to his brother Peers closed with the declaration that he would, to the last moment of his life, whatever his situation, resist the emancipation of the Catholics, "so help him God!" All tyrants think themselves immortal; the Catholics and their cause outlived the Duke of York, and triumphed. His speech, however, coming from the presumptive heir to the Crown, had a great share in deciding the majority of the Lords against the measure, and acted with great effect upon the congenial mass of brute ignorance and bigotry which is found ready to deny civil rights to all outside the pale of its own Church.

On the 5th January, 1827, the Duke of York died. Wallace, in his "Life of George IV", says: "Standing in the relation of heir-presumptive to the Throne; obstinately and obtusely fortified against all concession to the Catholics; serving as a ready and authoritative medium of Toryism and intolerance to reach, unobserved, the Royal ear—his death had a great influence upon the state of parties, and was especially favorable to the ascendancy of Mr. Canning. He, some weeks

only before he died, and when his illness had already commenced, strenuously urged the King to render the Government uniform and anti-Catholic—in other words, to dismiss Mr. Canning; and, had he recovered, Mr. Canning must have ceased to be Foreign Minister, or the Duke to be Commander-in-Chief. The Duke of York was not without personal good qualities, which scarcely deserved the name of private virtues, and were overclouded by his private vices. He was constant in his friendships—but who were his friends and associates? Were they persons distinguished in the State, in literature, in science, in arts, or even in his own profession of arms? Were they not the companions and sharers of his dissipations and prodigalities? He did not exact from his associates subserviency or form; but it was notorious that, from the meanness of his capacity, or the vulgarity of his tastes, he descended very low before he found himself at his own social level. His services as Commander-in-Chief were beyond all measure over-rated. Easy access, diligence, a mechanical regularity of system, which seldom yielded to solicitation, and never discerned merit; an unenvying, perhaps unscrupulous, willingness to act upon the advice and appropriate the measures of others more able and informed than himself; these were his chief merits at the Horse Guards. But, it will be said, he had an uncompromising, conscientious fidelity to his public principles; this amounts to no more than that his bigotry was honest and unenlightened. His death, perhaps, was opportune; his non-accession fortunate for the peace of the country and the stability of his family on the Throne. Alike incapable of fear and foresight, he would have risked the integrity of the United Kingdom rather than concede the Catholic claims; and the whole Monarchy rather than sanction Reform. It would be easy to suggest a parallel, and not always to his advantage, between the constitution of his mind and that of James, Duke of York, afterwards James II, whose obstinate bigotry forced the nation to choose between their liberties and his deposition from the Throne."

In 1827 the Duke of Clarence obtained, after much opposition, a further vote of £8,000 a year to himself, besides

£6,000 a year to the Duchess. The Duke of Clarence also had £3,000 a year further, consequent on the death of the Duke of York, making his allowance £43,000 a year.

In April, 1829, the infamous Duke of Cumberland had stated, that if the King gave his assent to the Catholic Emancipation Bill he (the Duke) would quit England never to return to it. The Right Honorable Thomas Grenville says, in a letter dated April 9th: "There is some fear that a declaration to that effect may produce a very general cheer even in the dignified assembly of the House of Lords". How loved these Brunswicks have been even by their fellow peers!

On the 10th of April, the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill passed the House of Lords, the Duke of Wellington confessing that civil war was imminent if the relief was longer delayed.

On June 26th, 1830, the Royal physicians issued a bulletin, stating that "it had pleased Almighty God to take from this world the King's most excellent Majesty." Most excellent majesty! A son who threatened his mother to make public the invalidity of her marriage; a lover utterly regardless of the wellbeing of any one of his mistresses; a bigamous husband, who behaved most basely to his first wife, and acted the part of a dishonorable scoundrel to the second; a brother at utter enmity with the Duke of Kent; a son who sought to aggravate the madness of his Royal father; a cheat in gaming and racing. He dies because lust and luxury have, through his lazy life, done their work on his bloated carcass, and England sorrows for the King's "most excellent majesty"!

George IV was a great King. Mrs. J. R. Greer, in her work on "Quakerism", says that he once went to a woman's meeting in Quaker dress. "His dress was all right; a grey silk gown, a brown cloth shawl, a little white silk handkerchief with hemmed edge round his neck, and a very well poked Friend's bonnet, with the neatly-crimped border of his clear muslin cap tied under the chin, completed his disguise." Royal George was detected; but we are told that the Quakers, who recognised their visitor, were careful to treat him with courtesy and deference!

In the ten years' reign, the official expenditure for George IV

and his Royal Family was at the very least £16,000,000 sterling. Windsor Castle cost £894,500, the Pavilion at Brighton is said to have cost a million, and another half-million is alleged to have been expended on the famous "Cottage". After the King's death his old clothes realised £15,000.

Thackeray says of him that he "never resisted any temptation; never had a desire but he coddled it and pampered it; if he ever had any nerve, he frittered it away among cooks, and tailors, and barbers, and furniture-mongers, and opera dancers . . . all fiddling, and flowers, and feasting, and flattery, and folly . . . a monstrous image of pride, vanity, and weakness."

Wallace says: "Monarchy, doubtless, has its advantages; but it is a matter of serious reflexion that under a government called free, among a people called civilised, the claims of millions, and the contingent horrors of a civil war, should be thus dependent upon the distempered humors and paramount will of a single unit of the species".

CHAPTER VI.

THE REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.

William Henry, Duke of Clarence, Admiral of the Fleet, and third son of George III, born August 21st, 1765, succeeded his brother George IV as King of England, on the 26th June, 1833. The new King was then sixty-five years of age, and had been married, July 11th, 1818, to Adelaide Amelia Louisa Teresa Caroline, Princess of Saxe-Meiningen. Mrs. Dorothy Jordan, with whom William had lived, and who had borne him ten children, had fled to France to avoid her creditors, and had there died, neglected by the world, deserted by William, and in the greatest poverty. This Mrs. Jordan was sold to William by one Richard Ford, her former lover, who, amongst other rewards of virtue, was created a Knight, and made Police Magistrate at Bow Street. Mrs. Jordan's children bore the name of "Fitzclarence", and great dissatisfaction was expressed against the King, who, too mean to maintain them out of his large income, contrived to find them all posts at public cost or to saddle them on the pension list. At the date of William IV's accession, the imperial taxation was about £47,000,000; in 1880 it has increased to £81,276,409.

The annual allowances to the junior branches of the Royal Family in 1830, formerly included in the Civil List, and now paid separately, were as follows :

The Duke of Cumberland, £21,000. He had no increase on his marriage; the House of Commons rejected a motion to that effect: but an allowance of £6,000 a year for his son, Prince George, had been issued to him since he became a resident in this country. This is the Duke of Cumberland, who so loved his brother, William IV, that he intrigued with the Orangemen to force William's abdication, and to get made King in his stead. The Duke of Sussex received £21,000. The Duke of

Cambridge, father of the present Duke, had £27,000. He obtained an increase on his marriage of £6,000 a year. This Prince was charged with the Government of the family territory the kingdom of Hanover, and consequently resided but little in England. Princess Augusta, £13,000. The Princess Elizabeth of Hesse Homburg, £13,000. Princess Sophia, £13,000. The Duchess of Kent, including the allowances granted in 1831, for her daughter, the Princess Victoria, heir presumptive to the throne, £22,000. The Duke of Gloucester, including £13,000 which he received as the husband of the Princess Mary, £27,000. The Princess Sophia of Gloucester, his sister, £7,000. Queen Adelaide had £100,000 a year, and the residence at Bushey granted to her for life. Mrs. Fitzherbert, as the widow of George IV, was in receipt of £6,000 a year and the ten Fitzclarences also enjoyed places and pensions.

The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel were the King's Ministers, and although there was some personal hostility between William and the Iron Duke, they were at first his willing coadjutors in opposing either reduction of expenditure, or any kind of political or social reform. The quarrel between William as Duke of Clarence and the Duke of Wellington had arisen when William was Lord High Admiral. William had given improper orders to a military officer named Cockburn, which the latter had refused to obey. The Duke of Wellington refused to sacrifice Cockburn, and ultimately the Duke of Clarence resigned his office as Lord High Admiral, for which, says the Rev. Mr. Molesworth, he was "ill-qualified, and in which he was doing great mischief".

In November, 1830, Earl Grey, Lord Brougham, Lord Melbourne, and Lord Althorp came into office as leaders of the Whig party. With slight exception, in 1806, the Whigs had not been before in office during the present century, and very little indeed since 1762. The Whigs encouraged the Radical Reformers so far as to ensure their own accession to power; but it is evident that the Whig Cabinet only considered how little they could grant, and yet retain office. In finance, as well as reform, they were disloyal to the mass of the people who pushed them into power.

The Duke of Wellington and his Ministry resigned office in November, 1830, because the House of Commons wished to appoint a Select Committee to examine the Civil List. King William IV, according to the words of a letter written by him to Earl Grey, on December 1st, 1830, felt considerable "alarm and uneasiness" because Joseph Hume, and other Radical members, wished to put some check on the growing and already extravagant Royal expenditure. He objects "most strenuously", and says, referring on this especially to the Duchy of Lancaster: "Earl Grey cannot be surprised that the King should view with jealousy any idea of Parliamentary interference with the only remaining pittance of an independent possession which has been enjoyed by his ancestors, during many centuries, as their *private and independent estate*, and has now, as such, lawfully devolved upon him in right of succession. That he should feel that any successful attempt to deprive the Sovereign of this independent possession will be to lower and degrade him into the state and condition of absolute and entire dependence, as a pensioner of the House of Commons, to place him in the condition of an individual violating or surrendering a trust which had been held sacred by his ancestors, and which he is bound to transmit to his successors. The King cannot indeed conceive upon what plea such a national invasion of the *private* rights, and such a seizure of the private estates, of the Sovereign could be justified."

William IV reminds Earl Grey that the Chancellor of the Duchy is sworn to do all things "for the weal and profit of the King's Highness. And his Majesty has fair reason to expect that a pledge so solemnly taken will be fulfilled, and that he will be supported in his assertion of these *private* rights, not only of himself, but of his heirs and successors, as they have devolved upon him, *separate* from all other his possessions *jure corona*, and consequently, as his separate personal and private estate, vested in his Majesty, by descent from Henry VII in his body *natural*, and not in his body *politic* as King."

Earl Grey naturally promised to prevent Radical financial reformers from becoming too annoying to Royalty. The Whigs talk of economy out of office, and avoid it when in place.

Daniel O'Connell appears to have much troubled the King. Directly after the Dublin meeting in December, 1830, Sir Henry Taylor says: "The King observed that he would have been better pleased if this assembly of people had not dispersed quietly *at his bidding*, as the control which he has successfully exercised upon various occasions in this way appears to his Majesty the most striking proof of the influence he has acquired over a portion of the lower classes in Ireland".

It is pretended in the *Cabinet Register* for 1831, and was stated by Lord Althorp in Parliament, that "his Majesty most nobly and patriotically declined to add to the burdens of his people by accepting an outfit for his royal consort, though £54,000 had been granted by Parliament to the Queen of George III, as an outfit to purchase jewels, etc.". This is so little true, that it appears from the correspondence between the King and Earl Grey, that a grant for the Queen's outfit had been agreed to by the outgoing Tories, and would have been proposed by the new Whig Government, had not one of the cabinet (probably Lord Brougham) decidedly objected, on the ground that "proposing a grant for this purpose would have a bad effect on the House of Commons, and on public opinion"; and by a letter dated February 4th, 1831, from the King, it is clear that he only abandoned the claim when he found he could not get it. There is not a word about "the burdens of the people", although many at that time were in a starving condition. On the contrary, the Secretary of the King says, on February 6th, that the "disinclination shown in the House of Commons" to grant the outfit had "produced a very painful impression on his Majesty".

The King, afraid of the spread of Reform opinions, says that he "trusts that the Lord-Lieutenants and Deputy-Lieutenants of counties will be cautioned to scrutinise the ballots for the militia as far as possible, so as to endeavor to exclude from its ranks men of dangerous and designing character, whose influence might prove very pernicious upon a newly-established corps, and before they shall have acquired habits of discipline and subordination". And to show his desire for reform, he urges the Ministers to check the public gatherings, saying: "I am ignorant to what extent it may be in contemplation to increase the military

means, either by calling out the militia partially, or by an addition to the regular force; but I am convinced that the latter would be not only the most efficient, but the cheapest; and it would have the advantage of being applicable to all purposes".

The Reformer King—for this pretence has been made—in another letter says: "His Majesty is satisfied that he may rely upon Earl Grey's strenuous support in his determination to resist all attempts which may be made to sap the established rights of the Crown, and to destroy those institutions under which this country has so long prospered, while others have been suffering so severely from the effects of revolutionary projects, and from the admission of what are called radical remedies He is induced thus pointedly to notice the proposal of introducing *Election by Ballot*, in order to declare that nothing should ever induce him to yield to it, or to sanction a practice which would, in his opinion, be a protection to concealment, would abolish the influence of fear and shame, and would be inconsistent with the manly spirit and the free avowal of opinion which distinguish the people of England. His Majesty need scarcely add that his opposition to the introduction of another, yet more objectionable proposal, the adoption of *Universal Suffrage*, one of the wild projects which have sprung from revolutionary speculation, would have been still more decided."

How William IV could ever have been suspected of being favorable to Reform is difficult to comprehend. As Duke of Clarence he had supported the Slave Trade, and declared that "its abolition should meet with his most serious and most unqualified opposition". When the Reform Bill actually became law, although William IV did not dare to veto it, he refused to give the royal assent in person. J. A. Roebuck, M.P., said that he believed William IV "to have been very weak and very false; a finished dissembler," and always bitterly hostile to reform.

The King not only hindered Reform until revolution was imminent, and the flames of burning castles and mansions were rising in different parts of England: he condescended to deceive his ministers; he allowed his children to canvas peers against the Bill, and would have resorted to force to crush the Bir-

mingham Political Union, if he could have thrown the responsibility of this tyranny upon the Cabinet. In the King's eye the people were "the rabble". We find him "impatient" for the return of the Tories to power, and bitterly discontented when the orderly character of popular demonstrations rendered the employment of the military impossible.

The Earl of Munster, one of the King's ten children by Mrs. Jordan, and who was Governor of Windsor Castle, Colonel in the Army, Aide-de-Camp to the King, Lieutenant of the Tower, Tory, and State pensioner, being charged with having "unhandsomely intrigued against Earl Grey's Government", made the curious defence "that for six months before, and for twenty-four hours after the resignation" of the Grey Government "it was from certain circumstances out of his power to act in the matter imputed to him".

It is worthy of notice, as against Mr. Frederic Harrison's opinion, that no English monarch could now really interfere with the course of government in Great Britain, that in April 1832, William IV have written directions to Earl Grey, "that no instructions should be sent" to foreign ambassadors until they had "obtained his previous concurrence". And it is clear from a letter of the King's private secretary, that William gave these orders because he was afraid there was a "disposition . . . to unite with France in support of the introduction of liberal opinions and measures agreeably to the spirit of the times". Although the newspapers praised William, he does not seem to have been very grateful in private. In 1832 he declared to his confidential secretary that he had "long ceased to consider the press (the newspaper family) in any other light than as the vehicle of all that is false and infamous".

In May 1832, the King and Queen were hissed and hooted, and literally pelted on their entry into London. It was in the following month that Lord Milton advised the people to refuse payment of taxes.

In January 1833, in a speech, not written for him, but made extemporaneously after dinner, William IV said, to compliment the American ambassador, "that it had always been a matter

of serious regard to him that he had not been born a free, independent American". We regret that the whole family have not long since naturalised themselves as American citizens. But such a sentiment from the son of George III, from one who in his youth had used most extravagant phraseology in denunciation of the American rebels!

The family insanity, shown in the case of George II by his persistence in wearing his Dettingen old clothes; more notorious and less possible of concealment in that of George III; well known to all but the people as to George IV, who actually tried to persuade the Duke of Wellington that he (George) had led a regiment at Waterloo, was also marked in William IV. In April, 1832, the King's own secretary admits "distressing symptoms" and "nervous excitement", but says that the attack "is now subsiding". Raikes, a Tory, and also a king-worshipper, in his "Diary", under date May the 27th, 1834, says, after speaking of the King's "excitement" and "rather extraordinary" conduct, that "at the levée a considerable sensation was created the other day by his insisting that an unfortunate wooden-legged lieutenant should kneel down". On June 11th, visiting the Royal Academy, the President showed the King, amongst others, the portrait of Admiral Napier, and was astonished to hear his Majesty at once cry out: "Captain Napier may be damned, sir, and you may be damned, sir; and if the Queen was not here, sir, I would kick you down stairs, sir". The King's brother, his Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, died November 20th, 1834. Raikes says of him: "He was not a man of talent, as may be inferred from his nickname of Silly Billy". This is the Royal Family, the present head of which, according to Mr. Disraeli, is "physically and morally incapable of performing the regal functions", and which yet, according to that brilliant statesman, so fitly represents the intelligence and honor of Great Britain.

In 1836 Sir William Knighton died. He had been made private secretary to the late King, and had made his fortune by means of some papers which Colonel Macmahon, confidant of George IV, had when dying, and which came into Knighton's hands as medical attendant of the dying man. Sir W. Knighton was made a "Grand Cross", not for his bravery

in war, or intelligence in the State, but for his adroit manipulation of secrets relating to Lady Jersey, Mrs. Fitzherbert, and the Marchioness of Conyngham. Sir William Knighton and the latter lady were supposed to have made free with £300,000 ; but great larcenies win honor, and Sir W. Knighton died respected.

In August, 1836, William — hearing that the Duke of Bedford had helped O'Connell with money — ordered the Duke's bust, then in the gallery at Windsor, to be taken down and thrown into the lime kilns.

On June 20th, 1837, William IV died. Ernest, Duke of Cumberland, by William's death, became King of Hanover, and was on the same day publicly hissed in the Green Park. Naturally, in this loving family there was considerable disagreement for some time previous to the King's death between his Majesty and the Duchess of Kent.

The *Edinburgh Review*, soon after the King's death, while admitting that his understanding may not have been of as high an order as his good nature, says : " We have learned to forget the faults of the Duke of Clarence in the merits of William IV ". Where were these merits shown ? Was it in " brooding " — to use the expression of his own private secretary — over questions of whether he could, during the commencement of his reign, personally appropriate sums of money outside the Civil List votes ? Was it in desiring that Colonel Napier might be " struck off the half-pay list " for having made a speech at Devizes in favor of Parliamentary Reform ? Was it when he tried to persuade Earl Grey to make Parliament pay Rundell and Bridges' bill for plate — and this when the masses were in a starving condition ? Was it when he declared that he was " by no means dissatisfied " that a proposed meeting was likely to be so " violent and in other respects so objectionable " that it would afford the excuse for suppressing by force the orderly meetings which, says his secretary, " the King orders me to say he cannot too often describe as being, in his opinion, far more mischievous and dangerous " than those of " a more avowed and violent character " !

CHAPTER VII.

THE PRESENT REIGN.

HER present Majesty, Alexandrina Victoria, was born May 24th, 1819, and ascended the throne June 20th, 1837, as representing her father, the Duke of Kent, fourth son of George III. On February 10th, 1840, it being the general etiquette for the Brunswick family to intermarry amongst themselves, she was married to her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe Coburg, who received an allowance from the nation of £30,000 to compensate him for becoming the husband of his wife. The Queen, more sensible than others of the arduous position of a Prince Consort, wished her loyal husband to have £100,000 a year. The Government reduced this to £50,000. Joseph Hume and the Radicals reduced it still further to £30,000. For this annual payment the Prince, although expressing his dissatisfaction to Baron Stockmar, undertook to submit to naturalisation, to be the first subject in England, to reside rent free in the Royal Palaces, repaired at the cost of the nation. He also on his own account, and for his own profit, attended to various building speculations at the West-end of London and died very rich. He is known as Prince Albert the Good. His goodness is marked—not by parks given to the people as in the case of Sir Francis Crossley; not by improved dwellings for the people, as in the case of George Peabody; not by a large and costly market-place, freely given, as in the case of Miss Burdett Coutts—Peeress without her patent of Baroness;—but by statues erected in his honor in many cities and boroughs by a loyal people. As an employer of labor, the Prince's reputation is marked solely by these statues. As a Prince, he felt in his lifetime how much and how truly he was loved by his people: and at a dinner given to the Guards, Prince Albert, in a speech probably not revised beforehand, told the Household

Troops how he relied on them to protect the Throne against any assaults. The memory of the Prince is dear to the people; he has left us nine children to keep out of the tax-payers' pockets, his own large private accumulations of wealth being inapplicable to their maintenance, and his will being kept secret, so that the amount of his private property cannot be known.

Prince Albert was not happy; he writes to Stockmar: "Peel cut down my income; Wellington refused me my rank; the Royal Family cried out against the foreign interloper". In June, 1840, the Queen and Prince Albert, being desperately annoyed at the opposition offered to the Prince Albert Annuity Bill, employed or permitted Baron Stockmar to gain over some of the members of the House of Commons in a most irregular fashion. The attempt failed, but Baron Stockmar's orders were obeyed by the English Ministry then in power; as also in the appointment of the Royal Household in 1841.

The confidential and continuing adviser of Her Majesty from her succession to the throne was this German Baron Stockmar, whose influence was so great that the *Westminster Review* describes him as "this German adventurer", "the secret and irresponsible Minister" of the Queen. Baron Stockmar represented at the English Court solely the interests of Germany and Belgium. He had no sympathy with England, and often entirely neutralised the policy of the English Prime Minister of the day. There was at one time an intention of bringing "the unconstitutional position of the foreign Stockmar" before Parliament; but no member of Parliament was bold enough to encounter the united Whig and Tory influences, and the matter was suppressed.

It was the German Stockmar, on instructions from his German employers, who, by his intrigues, caused Prince Albert to be named sole Regent. Prince Albert says that Stockmar gained over the opposition Members of Parliament to consent to the Regency Bill, but he does not say what means the German Baron used to effect his object.

It is now certain that, during the Crimean War, much of our policy was secretly modified by Prince Albert and Baron

Stockmar. While it is pretended by Mr. Disraeli and others that to-day the Queen does not intermeddle in our politics, it is certain that from 1848 to 1854 Prince Albert and Baron Stockmar did claim and exercise for the Crown a right of secret supervision and interference. The Prince himself writes : " Victoria allows me to take an active part in foreign affairs ".

On March 20th, 1842, the Earl of Munster, eldest son of William IV, and who had been made Constable of Windsor Castle by Her Majesty, committed suicide. Although the eldest son of the late King, his position as a natural child excluded him from God's people, according to the Bible, and from all right to the Throne, according to our law.

Her Majesty's cousin, George William Frederick, Duke of Cambridge, is Commander-in-Chief of the Army. His Royal Highness is also Field-Marshal and Colonel. Naturally, in the Duke is found embodied the whole military talent of the Royal Family. His great-uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, carved " Klosterseven " on the Brunswick monuments. Frederick Duke of York, the uncle of the Duke of Cambridge, recalled from the field of battle, that he might wear in peace at home the laurels he had won abroad, added " Clarke " and " Tony " as names to vie with Cressy or Waterloo. The present Duke of Cambridge was, when Prince George, stationed in Yorkshire, in the famous " plug-plot " times, and his valiancy then threatened most lustily what he would do against the factory " turn-outs ", poor starved wretches clamoring for bread. In the army, the normal schoolmasters can tell how this brave Brunswicker rendered education difficult, and drove out, one by one, many of the best teachers. Soldiers who think too much make bad machines. It was the father of the present Duke of Cambridge who publicly expressed his disbelief in 1844-45, of the failure of the potato crop in Ireland, " because he had always found the potatoes at his own table very good ! "

For many years Her Majesty has taken but little part in the show ceremonials of State. Parliament is usually opened and closed by commission—a robe on an empty throne, and a speech read by deputy, satisfying the Sovereign's loyal subjects. It is, however, the fact that in real State policy her interference has

been most mischievous, and this especially where it affected her Prusso-German relatives. In the case of Denmark attacked by Prussia and Austria, and in the case of the Franco-Prussian War, English Court influences have most indecently affected our foreign relations.

When Her Majesty travels in England great precautions are taken to prevent her from coming into contact with the common people who are her loyal and devoted subjects. When Her Majesty is abroad, the natives of foreign parts, being much superior to the ordinary type of Briton, are allowed greater indulgence. In England railway stations are cleared, piers and docks are carefully purged of the presence of the vulgar British subject. In Germany Her Majesty is amongst those she loves, and there the same rigid exclusiveness is not maintained.

Her Majesty is enormously rich, and—as she is like her Royal grandmother—grows richer daily. She is generous, and a year or two since gave not quite half a day's income to the starving poor of India. A few months prior to this, many thousands of pounds were wasted in formally proclaiming her imperial title.

When Her Majesty ascended the throne, poor rates averaged 5s. 4½d. per head per annum; to-day they exceed 7s. The average Imperial taxation during the first ten years of Her Majesty's reign was under £50,000,000 a year. The taxation at the present day is over £81,000,000 a year. Pauperism and local and Imperial taxation are all on the increase, and despite agricultural laborers' outcries and workmen's strikes, it is agreed that Her Majesty's reign has brought us many blessings.

It is charged against me that I have unfairly touched private character. In no instance have I done so, except when the conduct of the individuals attacked affected the honor and welfare of the nation. My sayings and writings are denounced in many journals, and in Parliament, as seditious, and even treasonable. My answer is that fortunately Hardy, Tooke and Thelwall heard "Not guilty" given as a shield against a criticism which dared to experiment on prosecution. In case of need I rely on a like deliverance. I do not pretend here to have pleaded for Republicanism—I have only pleaded against the

White Horse of Hanover. I loathe these small German breast-bstarred wanderers, whose only merit is their loving hatred of one another. In their own land they vegetate and wither unnoticed; here we pay them highly to marry and perpetuate a pauper prince-race. If they do nothing, they are "good". If they do ill, loyalty gilds the vice till it looks like virtue.

APPENDIX.

TO-DAY the Civil List means only a portion of the sum appropriated for the maintenance and support of the Sovereign and Royal Household. Formerly the whole expenditure of the nation other than for naval and military purposes was included in the Civil List. Prior to Cromwell, the Civil List did not exist at all. The King was supposed to provide for all national expenditure out of his land and hereditary revenues, and any extra war expenditure was contributed by the various feudal lords, under the conditions of their several tenures. Deficiencies were made up, sometimes by forced loans, sometimes by Parliamentary grants, which, however, were by no means voted as a matter of course. Parliaments, less obsequious than at present, often refused to vote moneys which then came in great part from the pockets of their own class. The first recorded vote of a specific annual sum was in 1660 to King Charles II of £1,200,000, which continued through his reign; a like sum was voted to James II, and on the 2nd March, 1689, the Commons voted the same amount to William and Mary. To use the words of the Parliamentary Blue Book, "this amount was intended to meet the whole public expenditure"—that is, it was to cover the national outlay of every kind, whether civil or military. The first vote, especially distinguishing its applicability to the purposes of Civil Government, was a little later, in 1689, and probably arose through the war in Ireland and that with France. On the 25th of April, 1689, £600,000 was specifically voted for the Civil Government; but this included not only the cost of the Royal Family, but also every other disbursement for the purposes of Civil Government. On the 20th December, 1697, this vote was increased to £700,000, and the first Civil List Act which was ever passed is 9 and 10 William III, c. 23. The printed estimates show that

this Civil List included the whole Foreign Office expenditure, the Treasury and other offices of State, commissioners of trade, the whole of the judges, all the pensions, secret service money, rewards for apprehending ordinary criminals, extraordinary commissions, State printers' bill, etc. To-day the cost of the Royal Family alone is much more than the whole amount of the Civil List of 1699. The second Civil List Act, giving an equal grant during the reign of Anne, is the first which is in part preserved in the printed volumes of statutes, and is dated the 21st May, 1702. The sections remaining, however, only restrain grants and alienations of Crown lands or hereditary revenues. Queen Anne set an example which has not since been imitated. Queen Anne returned to the nation by way of donation towards public expenditure a very large proportion of her private savings. George I had a Civil List of £700,000 a year; but during his reign of twelve and a-half years Civil List debts were paid, amounting in all to at least £1,300,000. The imperfectly edited remains of the Acts of Parliament contained in the Statute Book, 7 George I, cap. 27, and 12 George I, cap. 2, and the reference to 11 George I, cap. 17, would make the Civil List debts defrayed by Parliament amount to £1,500,000. On the accession of George II, the Civil List was increased to £800,000. In 1720, Civil List debts were paid to the amount of £115,000, and in 1747 a further sum of £456,734. It was during the reign of George III that the robbery of the people, under the name of the Civil List, grew into a science. On the 24th October, 1760, the Civil List was fixed at £800,000, which was increased to £900,000, from the 5th January, 1777; a further increase of £60,000 a year was made in 1803 (this, we are inclined to think, being for the Prince of Wales), and £70,000 more was added on the Regency. If we understand the statutes rightly, £13,000 a year was also added from 1783 to 1815, when this sum grew into £48,000 per annum.

In addition to these increased allowances, the following sums were voted by Parliament for payment of the Civil List debts, a great deal of the early money being spent in bribing Peers and Commons:—1769, £513,511; 1777, £618,340; 1784,

£60,000; 1786, £200,000; 1802, £990,053; 1804, £591,842; 1805, £10,458; 1814, £218,857; 1816, £185,000; making a total of £3,398,061 of debts, in addition to the annual allowance and this not including the enormous payments of the debts of George Prince of Wales. But even these were trifles compared with the present rate of expenditure. In 1816, the Civil List underwent modification, items being now taken out of it, and transferred to the Consolidated Fund. On the accession of George IV, the Civil List, now including Ireland, was fixed at £1,166,000, of which £207,000 was for Ireland. This £207,000 was, with the exception of the pension list, wholly appropriated to Civil Government in Ireland. The sum of £109,000 was for Scotland, leaving for England £850,000; but this item still included the Foreign Office disbursements, now amounting to about £277,000, the salaries of all the judges, nearly £33,000, the pension list, the salaries of the Ministers of State, and other items. Between 1820 and 1830 the Casual Revenues produced £326,055 6s. 9d. of which the sum of £17,648 11s. 9d. figured under the head of charities; the executors of the Duke of York took £6,440 12s., and his Majesty, the First Gentleman in Europe, absorbed the remainder. On the accession of William IV, a pretended reduction, but real increase, of the Civil List took place.

A Parliamentary return, ordered to be printed by the House of Commons on the 26th July 1869, contains the only accessible official information as to the origin of the Civil List. On the 19th March, 1872, Sir Charles Dilke, in the House of Commons, treated the subject at great length in a vain endeavor to obtain Parliamentary investigation or more complete official returns.

As the national accounts are at present published, it is quite impossible for any unofficial person to learn the exact annual cost of the Royal Family. Part of the amount is given in the Finance Accounts on succeeding pages under the heading: "Civil List," £385,000; and "Annuities to the Royal Family", £161,000. These together, omitting the Civil List pensions, amounted, on 31st March 1882 to £546,000, and are now increased by the additional £10,000 voted last Session to Prince

Leopold. This supposed total of £546,000 is utterly misleading if anyone supposes it to represent the aggregate of the sums received annually by, or paid on account of, Royal personages from the taxpayers' pockets. To ascertain this total accurately it is necessary to go through the various estimates; and even then, without specially skilled knowledge, it is almost impossible to make even an approximate guess at the total cost of Royalty. There ought to be no reason why all the items of direct or indirect expenditure for or on behalf of the several members of the reigning family should not be collected together under one heading, and form one clear and easily distinguishable total.

It is contended by leading members of the Liberal and Conservative parties that the amounts voted from time to time to her Majesty and other Royal personages are so voted as some part of a bargain or honorable understanding by which, in consideration of certain lands or valuable properties surrendered by her Majesty, the nation accepted the responsibility of providing for the various princes and princesses, who otherwise would have no means of existence. I answer, first, that not only is there no such bargain or honorable understanding, but that it is utterly impossible any such bargain could have been made. If the bargain has been made by Parliament, it must have been embodied in some statute. No such statute exists. As to the surrender, her Majesty has never surrendered property to the value of one single halfpenny: but on the contrary, she retains and keeps as private property, in addition to her Civil List allowance, revenues which, for at least four reigns since the revolution of 1688, formed part of the Civil List income.

It is also urged that any objection to the Royal Family expenditure comes to-day with a very bad grace, as the amount of the Civil List expenditure is much less than it has been in previous reigns. To this I answer that, on the contrary, the amount directly received or indirectly enjoyed by the several members of the Royal Family is larger than it has been in any previous reign, even in the extravagant period of George III.

Taking, first, the question as to what, if any, was the

bargain or understanding between the Sovereign and the nation, and what, if anything, was surrendered by the Sovereign as part of the bargain, it is necessary to go back to the first Civil List grant, and to the statute by which the Civil List was established. This inquiry may start with the revolution of 1688, because the two previous votes to Charles II and James II become utterly immaterial. It cannot be pretended that William of Orange surrendered anything on his accession to the Throne, nor does the Civil List Act, 9th and 10th William III, cap. 23, recite or pretend any such surrender. William III, when he landed in this country, was in no sort of sense legally or morally the heir to any private estate which was then held by or had been held by James II, who was living himself, who had issue living, and who is not pretended ever to have ceded anything to William. Instead of there being any surrender by William III to the nation, there is a specific grant to William for life by Parliament as representing the nation. The grant is first by vote on the 25th April, 1689, and then by statute on the 21st December, 1697. There is no suggestion of any right of property which might have been left or was actually left by William to his heirs or successors. There is a mere grant for life, determining with William's death. On this death everything granted reverted to the nation, just as leasehold property, on the termination of a lease for life, reverts to the lessor. On the accession of Queen Anne, 8th March, 1702, we have the second Civil List Statute—1st Anne, Statute 1. In this there is again a grant to the Queen for life, but not the faintest suggestion that Anne had surrendered anything, or indeed that she had anything to surrender. On the contrary, there is a specific enactment forbidding and limiting the alienation of any of the revenues granted. After a recital that "the necessary expenses of supporting the Crown, or the greatest part of them, were formerly defrayed by a land revenue, which hath from time to time been diminished by the grants of former kings and queens of this realm," it is enacted by the 1st Anne, Statute 1, cap. 7, secs. 5 and 7, that "no grant shall be made of land for more than 31 years, or for 3 lives, and at a reasonable rent;" and that no other grant shall be made for any estate or term

longer than the life of the monarch, "and that any grant of either land or revenues contrary to such enactments shall be null and void". The third Civil List Act is 1st George, I, cap. 1, 1st August, 1714; and this, too, is utterly silent as to any surrender. George I, when he came to England, held property as Elector of Hanover, but that he kept. There is evidence that he repeatedly took from the English Treasury to increase his Hanoverian property, but there is not the slightest color for any contention that he ever surrendered to England the value of one farthing. The Hanoverian property, although actually much augmented by English moneys, is not now even remotely connected with this country, as it passed away in the male line on the accession of her present Majesty to the English Throne. The 1st George I, cap. 1, is, as in the two previous Civil List Statutes, a grant by Parliament on behalf of the nation, and it is only a grant for life. The fourth Civil List Act is dated 11th June, 1727, 1st George II, cap. 1, and here, once more, there is an utter absence of any sort of surrender or pretence of surrender; it is again a grant for life only. In 1760 we find a change in words, although the facts were exactly similar. In the preamble to the Civil List Act, on the accession of George III, it is recited that the King had been graciously pleased to signify his consent that "such disposition might be made of his interest in the hereditary revenues as might best conduce to the utility and satisfaction of the public". This recital was so much pure inventive audacity. George III had no legal interest whatever, and the words were of no value. George III could not have inherited from his grandfather, George II, that which his grandfather only held for life, and of which the reversion was not in George III, but in the nation. The previous grant was not to George II, his heirs and successors; it was a grant to George II, for life only. The wording of the new recital in the Civil List Act of George III was vague, but it has served its purpose, and has been textually repeated in the three succeeding Civil List Statutes. It is the sole foundation for the whole of the repeated declarations of a surrender, which is purely imaginary and has no real foundation in fact.

Having now disposed of the surrender myth, I come to the bargain or honorable-understanding legend. When was the bargain made? Between whom, and where is it recorded? In 1736 George II knew of no bargain on the part of Parliament, even to the extent of providing for the Prince of Wales. On the 22nd February, 1737, it was proposed to make an annual allowance to Frederick, Prince of Wales, and George II objected, on the ground that the responsibility to provide for the Prince of Wales rested with himself, and that "it would be highly indecorous to interfere between father and son". The bargain is, like the surrender, a myth; but it has now grown, by dint of repetition, into a firm article of faith on the part of the occupants of both front benches of the House of Commons. But if there is no actual bargain, it may still be urged, is there not some honorable understanding? I reply that arrangements with reigning families cannot be, and ought not to be, the subject of any understanding. They should be dealt with by specific enactment.

That no such honorable understanding or bargain was known or suspected by Her Majesty's predecessor, William IV, is quite clear; for we find William IV applying by letter, first to the Duke of Wellington, and, on the latter's resignation, to Earl Grey, asking that a sum of money might be issued to the Queen for an outfit. To this Earl Grey replies that he will "have considerable difficulties to encounter from the jealousy of the House of Commons". Now would have been the time for William to plead the bargain or honorable understanding, if any such existed; but, instead of this, the King writes that he is "perfectly satisfied with Earl Grey's letter, and quite sensible of the difficulty which may occur". Even the Tory Duke of Wellington had only promised the King that he would "endeavor, if possible, to obtain some money to aid at least in defraying the cost of the Queen's outfit". And, at last, one of Earl Grey's Cabinet having positively objected, the proposed application was abandoned by the King, in order, as his Majesty says, to avoid "unpleasant discussion" in the House of Commons.

Two of the items out of the list of those which originally

made up the income of the Civil List, which to-day are treated as private property of the monarch and of the Prince of Wales respectively, are the several incomes of the Duchy of Lancaster and of the Duchy of Cornwall. In the reigns of William III and of Queen Anne the incomes of each of these Duchies went to make up the total Civil List enjoyed by the monarch, and it was not until the accession of William IV that the Duchy of Lancaster was claimed as private property. When Lord Holland was appointed Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in 1830, it is clear that he regarded the Duchy as national property, and that this view was at first maintained by the Liberal Government, of which Earl Grey was the head, although the Cabinet soon receded from their patriotic position. I find the King expressing in writing¹ his "considerable alarm and uneasiness", because it appeared to be in the contemplation of Lord Holland, not only to admit of the threatened interference of Parliament in the concerns of the Duchy of Lancaster, but even to promote it. So far from concurring in any surrender, William IV strenuously protests "that any successful attempt to deprive the Sovereign of his independent possession will be to lower and degrade him into the state and condition of absolute and entire dependence as a pensioner of the House of Commons", and he adds that he "cannot indeed conceive upon what plea such a national invasion of the private rights and a seizure of the private estate of the Sovereign could be justified". Then, for the first time since the Revolution of 1688, was the Duchy of Lancaster claimed by the monarch "as his separate personal and private estate, vested in his Majesty by descent from Henry VII in his body natural, and not in his body politic as King".

In 1830 the then Chancellor of the Exchequer stated in the House of Commons that the revenues of the Duchies of Cornwall and of Lancaster were not included, "because those of Cornwall never became the property of the Crown unless when there was no heir apparent of the Throne; and the

¹ "Correspondence of Earl Grey with William IV," page 9.

revenues of Lancaster had been from a very early period subject to peculiar regulations totally independent of its authority". On the accession of her present Majesty, Mr. D. Whittle Harvey, M.P., formally claimed the right of Parliament to inquire into and appropriate the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall and the Duchy of Lancaster; but he was opposed by the Government, and, on motion, defeated by 184 votes to 52.

The amount of the Civil List granted to William III was first £600,000 per annum, and was afterwards increased to £700,000 per annum. The Civil List of her present Majesty, omitting the Civil List Pensions, is £385,000. But the £700,000 of William III included the whole charge for the civil expenditure. That is, it included every item except for army, navy, and ordnance. The annual interest on the National Debt was then less than £200,000. The £385,000 to her present Majesty are only part of the expenditure on behalf of her Majesty. Many items which were included in the Civil List in the reign of William III are now charged on the Consolidated Fund; many other items which were included in the Civil List in the same reign are now separately voted in the Civil Service Estimates; some few items which were formerly included in the Civil List are now, by careful search, even to be discovered in the Army and Navy Estimates. The items which are covered by the £385,000 seem, in the Civil List of William III, to have been covered by a very much smaller sum. The £700,000 to William III included all payments to other members of the Royal Family; not one of these is included in her Majesty's Civil List. The £700,000 to William III included all perpetual and other pensions, all diplomatic and consular expenditure, all salaries of Ministers of State; not one of these is included in her Majesty's £385,000.

The actual cost of Royalty is not easy to give accurately. The following list does not profess to be complete, but it is the best I can compile from the National Accounts as at present made up. Some of the items left blank as to amount could only be exactly filled in by persons who are or have been connected with the Government.

Her Majesty the Queen :—

	£	s.	d.
Civil List	385,000	0	0
Perpetual pension charged on the Consolidated Fund in lieu of prisage and butlerage on wines imported into the County and Duchy of Lancaster	803	0	0
Ancient Fee voted each year in Civil Service Esti- mates, Class VII.. .. .	101	0	0
Net income of the Duchy paid over to her Majesty after all deductions, about	41,000	0	0
(The gross income was £78,177 9s. 6d.)			
Repairs of palaces, kitchen gardens, etc., in the per- sonal occupation of her Majesty—Civil Service Esti- mates, Class I	15 665	0	0
(This amount varies every year, and, in 1870, was as high as £30,535.)			
Repairs of palaces partly occupied by Her Majesty ..	6,356	0	0
(For the year ending 31st March, 1882, these cost £8,519.)			
Royal yachts, cost not stated or capable of being dis- tinguished, but voted in Navy Estimates			
(These have been stated at over £100,000 per annum, and are given in the <i>Financial Reform Almanack</i> for 1883, at £32,313. A proposal has been made this year to spend £55,000 extra in repairing these Royal yachts.)			
Naval aides-de-camp to her Majesty	1,460	0	0
Military aides-de-camp to her Majesty (in addition to half-pay)	1,150	0	0
(These have also allowances in lieu of servants and table money.)			
Queen's Plates, to be run for in Scotland—Civil Service Estimates, Class II	218	0	0
Queen's Plates, to be run for in Ireland	1,562	6	2
Her Majesty's charities and bounties in Scotland— Civil Service Estimates, Class VI	1,300	0	0
Her Majesty's bounty (Ireland)—Same vote	90	0	0
Her Majesty's Limner	97	0	0
Her Majesty's Historiographer	184	0	0
Her Majesty's Clockmaker	16	13	4
Civil Service Estimates, Class II,			
Allowance to Turncock and Engineer, Windsor Castle Civil Service Estimates, Class VI	201	12	9
Attendants, Albert Memorial, Windsor Castle.. ..	120	0	0
Laborers, Turncock, and Ratcatcher at Buckingham Palace	201	0	0
In Navy Estimates, expenses on account of her Majesty and Royal Household (1880)	1,236	4	10
(This amount varies yearly ; in 1879 it was £1,454 15s. 4d.)			

While it is impossible to state the amount exactly, it is quite certain that the amount of cost of her Majesty cannot be less than £550,000. (The *Financial Reform Almanack* states the total payments on account of her Majesty at £622,133.) The regilding of the Albert Memorial railings last year cost £500. £5,000 is to be paid for restoring St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

Nothing is here stated as to any private property owned by her Majesty, either as bequeathed to her by the late Prince Consort, or by the miser Neild, or as resulting from her own economies.

The Finance Accounts give £161,000 as the amount of annuities to members of the Royal Family, viz. :—

Her Royal Highness the Princess Royal, Crown Princess of Prussia	£	s.	d.
	8,000	0	0

(A grant of £40,000 was made to Her Royal Highness on her marriage.)

His Royal Highness Albert Edward, Prince of Wales	40,000	0	0
---	--------	---	---

(A Grant of £23,455 was made on his coming of age and marriage.)

Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales	10,000	0	0
His Royal Highness Alfred Ernest Albert, Duke of Edinburgh.. .. .	25,000	0	0

(The Navy Estimates contain items not included in this sum.)

Her Royal Highness Helena Augusta Victoria Princess Christian of Schleswig - Holstein - Sunderbourg - Augustenburg	6,000	0	0
--	-------	---	---

(A grant of £30,000 was made to her Royal Highness on her marriage.)

Her Royal Highness Louise Caroline Alberta, Princess, Marchioness of Lorne	6,000	0	0
--	-------	---	---

(A grant of £30,000 was made to her Royal Highness on her marriage.)

Prince Christian has salary and perquisites as Ranger of Windsor Home Park, and the use of Cumberland Lodge, rent-free.

His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert, Duke of Connaught and Strathern	25,000	0	0
---	--------	---	---

(The Military Estimates include items not covered by this sum.)

His Royal Highness Prince Leopold George Duncan Albert, Duke of Albany	15,000	0	0
--	--------	---	---

(This will in future be £25,000, and does not include items for travelling.)

	£	s.	d.
Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge ..	6,000	0	0
Her Royal Highness the Princess Augusta, Duchess of Mecklenberg-Strelitz	6,000	0	0
His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge	12,000	0	0
(This, of course, does not include the military salaries of his Royal Highness, which are, as Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, £4,500, and as Colonel of the Grenadier Guards, £2,200. Nor does it include the game-preserving and other benefits enjoyed by his Royal Highness as Ranger of St. James', Green, Hyde, and Richmond Parks, who for his pleasure excludes the public from access to a large portion of the last-named park, enclosed for game. The game- keepers are paid for by the public.)			
Her Royal Highness the Princess Mary, Princess of Teck	5,000	0	0

Most of the above Royal personages occupy public buildings, for which they pay no rental to the State. These buildings are maintained in repair at the public cost, and each such item of expenditure ought properly to figure as an addition to the several sums set opposite the respective names. So the cost of several of the so-called Royal, but really public, parks is increased, and the access to these by the public diminished, by residences, grounds, and game-preserving enclosures for the benefit of some of the above Royal pensioners.

There is this year an item, "St. James's Palace, for repairs to the apartments of her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge, for external and internal repairs to Clarence House, and for similar repairs of houses and apartments occupied by members of the Royal Family and their respective households, £1,962"; and new hangings at St. James's Palace are to cost £3,600. Last year the charge was £2,532. In previous years it has ranged about £1,600, but in 1874 was £3,089.

When the members of the Royal Family travel, the cost is, at least in some instances, borne by the taxpayer. There is each year, in Vote 14 of the Navy Estimates, a charge "for conveyance by sea of the Royal household: entertainment of Royal personages". The charges which ought to be expressly and clearly stated form, in fact, an additional allowance in each instance. For example, the £40,000 to the Prince of Wales does not include the sum of £16,216 15s., a perpetual pension paid to

his Royal Highness as Duke of Cornwall for "the loss of duty on the coinage of tin and in lieu of post groats and white rents". This compensation-annuity was settled in 1838 on the scale of the supposed clear receipts of the previous ten years, but it is not easy to comprehend the fairness of the arrangement, as the total net revenue of the Duchy from all sources was only £11,536, and £16,216 15s. seems an excessive perpetual compensation for the loss of a part only of this £11,536. Nor does the £40,000 include another small perpetual pension paid by the nation to his Royal Highness for the loss of prisage and butlerage on wine imported into England through the county of Cornwall. The amount of this perpetual pension is paid from moneys invested in the Bank, and which ought, I think, to be in the names of trustees; but I am not at present able to give the exact particulars. The gross income for 1882 of the Duchy of Cornwall, which is to-day treated as the private property of the Prince of Wales, was £94,532. The amount of actual cash paid over to his Royal Highness was £63,870 8s. 8d. In 1868, when the gross revenue was only £78,447, the net amount received by the Prince of Wales was £58,816. During the reigns of William III and Queen Anne the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall were paid into the Exchequer as part of the public revenue. Several pensions which, to the extent of £5,300 per annum, were formerly paid out of the income of the Duchy of Cornwall have since been transferred to the taxpayers, thereby increasing the annual actual income of the Prince of Wales by the amount of those pensions. The perpetual pension granted in 1674 to John Granville, Earl of Bath, and on account of a moiety of which the nation still pays £1,200 a year to the heirs of Captain Garth, is one of the charges which—if the Duchy of Cornwall is private property—ought to-day to be paid out of the income of the Duchy, and not out of the national taxation. When the Prince of Wales attained his majority the accumulations of the Duchy were £572,075 in the Funds, and £29,646 cash in Bank. The nation also pays for the repairs of Marlborough House, the residence of the Prince of Wales. These repairs vary each year, and amount in all to a very considerable sum. This year the estimate is £2,878; last year

the cost was £2,397; in 1880, £2,970; in 1878, £6,450; in 1877, £4,100; in 1870 it was as high as £7,600. There are, of course, to be added the military salaries of his Royal Highness. In the Navy Estimates there are "Entertainment allowances to Captain of her Majesty's ship 'Bacchante'". In the Navy Estimates for 1878-9 I find, as spent in 1877: "Expenses incurred in connexion with the visit of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to India, £4,306 14s. 8d.": this in addition to the large original grant of £142,000. "Pay of Equerry to Duke of Edinburgh;" "Allowance to messes of her Majesty's ship 'Sultan', while his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh was in command." The last item occurs in two other years.

WORKS
BY
CHARLES BRADLAUGH.

*Published by A. and H. BRADLAUGH BONNER, and Sold by
R. FORDER, 28 Stonecutter Street, E.C.*

Doubts in Dialogue. Reprinted from the *National Reformer*.
72 pp., demy 8vo, neat boards, 1s.

Labor and Law. Dealing with the Eight Hours' Movement
and other Questions affecting Labor and Legislation. With
Two fine Portraits taken in 1883 and 1890, and a Memoir
by J. M. Robertson, 282 pp., demy 8vo, 5s.

Collected Speeches. With portrait specially executed by Messrs.
Elliot and Fry (in Sept., 1890). 216 pp., demy 8vo (uni-
form with above), 5s.

The Freethinker's Text-Book. Part I—Section 1. "The Story
of the Origin of Man, as told by the Bible and by Science."
Section 2. "What is Religion?" "How has it Grown?"
"God and Soul." Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Theological Essays. Bound in 2 vols., cloth, uniform.

Vol. I contains: Heresy, its Morality and Utility; Is
there a God?; Has Man a Soul?; Were Adam and Eve
our first Parents?; Who was Jesus Christ?; What did Jesus
Teach?; The Atonement; Life of Abraham; Life of Jacob;
Life of Moses; Life of David; Life of Jonah; The Twelve
Apostles; When were our Gospels Written?; Plea for
Atheism. 3s.

Vol. II contains: Humanity's Gain from Unbelief; Notes
on Christian Evidences (In Reply to the Oxford House
Papers); A Cardinal's Broken Oath; Mr. Gladstone's Reply
to Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity; Supernatural and
Rational Morality; A Few Words about the Devil; Has
Man a Soul? (Debate with Rev. W. M. Westerby); Secu-
larism Unphilosophical, Unsocial, and Immoral (Debate
with Rev. Dr. McCann). 3s.

Political Essays. Bound in 3 books.

Series I contains: Impeachment of the House of Bruns-
wick; Real Representation of the People; John Churchill,
Duke of Marlborough; Mr. Gladstone or Lord Salisbury;
Five Dead Men whom I knew when living; Cromwell and

Works by Charles Bradlaugh.

Washington ; The Land, the People, and the Coming Struggle. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Series II contains: Taxation ; The Channel Tunnel ; The Radical Programme : Compulsory Land Cultivation. In paper cover, 1s.

Series III contains: Parliament and the Poor: What the Legislature can do, What it Ought to do ; The Employers' Liability Bill (An Open Letter to Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P.) ; Capital and Labor ; Civil Lists and Grants to the Royal Family ; Letter to Lord Randolph Churchill, M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer ; What Freemasonry is, What it has been, and What it Ought to be ; A Cardinal's Broken Oath. In paper cover, 1s.

Socialism. Containing the written Debates with Annie Besant and E. Belfort Bax, and "Socialism : its fallacies and dangers". In paper cover, 1s.

Autobiography, written in 1873. Now reprinted, 36pp., in cover, with portrait. 4d.

Hints to Emigrants. Notes of employment, wages, costs of living, etc., personally made during three journeys in the United States of America. (Pubd. at 1s.) Post free, 6d.

DEBATES—All Verbatim Reports.

God, Man, and the Bible. Three nights' discussion at Liverpool with the Rev. Dr. BAYLEE. 6d.

What does Christian Theism Teach ? Two nights' Public debate in London with the Rev. A. J. HARRISON. 6d.

Does the Church of England Teach Eternal Torment ? Written debate with the Rev. J. LIGHTFOOT. 6d.

Is it Reasonable to Worship God ? Two nights' debate at Nottingham with the Rev. R. A. ARMSTRONG. 1s.

The above, bound with the Bishop of Peterborough's discourses and Mr. Bradlaugh's replies (*now O. P. in separate form*), in 1 vol. cloth, 3s. (Uniform with Essays.)

Has Humanity Gained from Unbelief ? Two nights' debate at Newcastle with Rev. MARSDEN GIBSON, M.A. Together with the pamphlet of same Title. 1s.

Has Man a Soul ? Two nights' debate at Burnley, with the Rev. W. M. WESTERBY. 1s.

Secularism Unphilosophical, Unsocial, and Immoral. Three nights' debate in London with the Rev. Dr. McCANN. 1s.

Will Socialism benefit the English People ? One night's debate with H. M. HYNDMAN. 3d.

Socialism : For and Against. Written debate with Mrs. BESANT. 4d.

Works by Charles Bradlaugh.

Will Socialism benefit the English People? Written debate with E. BELFORT BAX, 6d.

Eight Hours Movement. One night's debate with H. M. HYNDMAN. 6d.

PAMPHLETS (Political)—		s. d.
The Eight Hours Movement	o	0
Capital and Labor. New edition	o	2
Labor's Prayer	o	1
How are we to Abolish the Lords? 2nd edition	o	1
Poverty, and its Effects on the Political Condition of the People. New edition, revised and partly re-written	o	1
Employers' Liability Bill : A Letter to Thomas Burt, M.P.	o	3
Parliament and the Poor : What the Legislature can do ; what it ought to do	o	2
The Radical Programme. 2nd edition	o	2
Mr. Gladstone's Reply to Col. Ingersoll on Christianity	o	1
Taxation : how it originated, how it is spent, and who bears it. 2nd edition	o	6
The Channel Tunnel : ought the Democracy to support or oppose it ?	o	2
Compulsory Land Cultivation	o	3
Socialism : its fallacies and dangers	o	2
Some Objections to Socialism	o	1
Letter to Lord Randolph Churchill, M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer. 16 pp.	o	1
Mr. Gladstone or Lord Salisbury ; which? An appeal to the Electors. 12 pp.	o	1
The Real Representation of the People	o	2
The Land, the People, and the Coming Struggle	o	2
What Freemasonry is, what it has been, and what it ought to be.	o	2
The True Story of my Parliamentary Struggle. Containing a Verbatim Report of the proceedings before the Select Committee of the House of Commons ; Mr. Bradlaugh's Three Speeches at the Bar of the House, etc., etc.	o	6
May the House of Commons Commit Treason ?	o	½
John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough : " Mob, Scum, and Dregs "	o	2
A Cardinal's Broken Oath	o	2

Works by Charles Bradlaugh.

Five Dead Men whom I knew when living. Sketches of	s. d.
Robert Owen, Joseph Mazzini, John Stuart Mill,	
Charles Sumner, and Ledru Rollin	o 4
Cromwell and Washington: a Contrast	o 6

PAMPHLETS (Theological)—

Notes on Christian Evidences. In reply to the Oxford	
House Papers, with rejoinders by Rev. E. S. Talbot,	
M.A., Rev. Francis Paget, D.D., W. Lock, M.A.,	
T. B. Strong, B.A., Rev. V. S. Coles, M.A.	o 6
When were our Gospels Written?	o 6
The Laws relating to Blasphemy and Heresy	o 6
Heresy; its Morality and Utility. A Plea and a Justifi-	
cation	o 9
The Christian's Creed. A Reproduction of Mr. Brad-	
laugh's first pamphlet. In cover	o 2
Humanity's Gain from Unbelief	o 2
Supernatural and Rational Morality	o 1
Were Adam and Eve our First Parents? (New Edition)	o 1
A Few Words about the Devil	o 1
A Plea for Atheism	o 3
Has Man a Soul?	o 2
Is there a God?	o 1
Who was Jesus Christ?	o 1
What did Jesus Teach?	o 1
Life of Abraham	o 1
Life of Jacob	o 1
Life of Moses	o 1
Life of David	o 2
Life of Jonah	o 1
The Twelve Apostles	o 1
The Atonement	o 1

Verbatim Report of the Trial, The Queen against Bradlaugh and Besant. With Portraits and Autographs of the two Defendants. Second edition, with Appendix, containing the Judgments of Lords Justices Bramwell, Brett, and Cotton. Cloth, 5s.

Biography of C. Bradlaugh, by Adolphe S. Headingley; with Appendix by W. Mawer. With photograph. The fullest and best biography of Mr. Bradlaugh yet published. Reduced price, 1s. 6d.

Large Photograph, 23½ by 18½ inches, 4s.

Large Litho portrait, fit for framing, 6d.